

150005

JPRS-UK0-86-006

27 MARCH 1986

# USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 17, NOVEMBER 1985

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

19991021 140

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**  
Approved for Public Release  
Distribution Unlimited

**FBIS**

**FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE**

Reproduced From  
Best Available Copy

REPRODUCED BY  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

7  
163  
A08

## NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

## PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

USSR REPORT  
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 17, NOVEMBER 1985

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year).

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL -- The Party's Leninist Strategy.....	1
M. S. Gorbachev Press Conference at the Soviet Press Center in Geneva 21 November 1985.....	17
FOURTH SESSION OF THE USSR SUPREME SOVIET ELEVENTH CONVOCATION	
Address by Deputy M. S. Gorbachev.....	34
Speech by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary, Deputy M. S. Gorbachev.....	37
Truth of an Ardent Life (L. Golovanov).....	57
TOWARDS THE 27TH PARTY CONGRESS -- DISCUSSION OF CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE DRAFTS	
Exactingness (V. Arkhipov).....	70
On the New Edition of the CPSU Program	
From Microcosmos to Cosmos (V. Goldanskiy).....	84
Powerful Means of Accelerating the Development of Soviet Society (L. Gordon and E. Klopov).....	86
For the People's Health (S. Shenkman).....	89

For the Building of Communism -- A Reliable Defense (V. Samoylenko).....	90
Material Basis for Rallying the Socialist Countries (G. Kharakhashyan).....	92
On Changes in the CPSU Statute (Letters From CPSU Members).....	93
Examining the Problems of Measuring Labor Productivity (L. Zhukov and Yu. Perevoshchikov).....	102
OUR KNOWLEDGE, STRENGTH AND WEAPON	
Spirit of Party-Mindedness (M. Kozmin).....	115
REALITIES OF THE CONTEMPORARY EPOCH	
Road of Closer Friendship and Cooperation (V. Kuzmenko).....	128
25th Congress of the French Communist Party: Hopes and Struggle for the Future (Maxim Gremetz).....	135
LITERARY CRITICISM AND BIBLIOGRAPHY	
Books of the Terrible Years (I. Pozdeyeva and A. Samsonov).....	146
Bookshelf.....	155



PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 17  
November 1985

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author(s) :

Editor(s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatelstvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : November 1985

Signed to press : 28 November 1985

Copies : 930,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda".  
"Kommunist", 1985

EDITORIAL -- THE PARTY'S LENINIST STRATEGY

AU310701 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 85 (signed to press 28 Nov 85)  
pp 3-16

[Uppercase passages published in italics]

[Text] Having examined and approved the draft new edition of the CPSU Program, the draft amendments to the party statutes and the draft guidelines for the economic and social development of the USSR in the 12th 5-year period and up to the year 2000, and having submitted them to a party-wide and nationwide discussion, the October (1985) plenum of the party's Central Committee, as a matter of fact, raised to a new stage the combination of scientific socialism with the movement of the millions of working people, with the live creativity of the masses. The substance and objectives of the multiform party work in preparation for its 27th congress, and the documents which the congress is expected to adopt appear before us precisely on such a wide, historical scale. This signifies that the point is not only to disseminate these documents, to explain the tasks, new ideas and generalizations set forth in them, but also to accept the party's present directives for guidance to action, to ensure that the discussion is businesslike and aimed at the practical settlement of problems posed by life, and to make this discussion creative. Note even one single useful idea, and not even one single sensible suggestion must be left without attention. This is a principled issue, an issue of the party's prestige, of the prestige of our people's rule, of their link with the masses. In this way each party organization and labor collective, each communist and conscious laborer is expected not only to profoundly assimilate the party's strategy, but also to assume an active Marxist-Leninist class, patriotic and internationalist position, to understand one's own maneuver, and to take responsibility upon oneself.

We have the right to speak about a new stage in scientific socialism with the workers' movement and the creativity of the masses primarily because the draft of the party's main theoretical and political document contains a complex of ideas making a new step forward in the creative development of Marxism-Leninism. These ideas accurately and adequately reflect the domestic and international conditions of the party's activity in the present highly complex segment of history, a segment that in many respects is crucial in its nature.

The novelty of this stage is also being determined by the fact that the new ideas fall on new soil. These ideas are addressed to a mass interested in the triumph of our common cause, to a mass that thinks in a Marxist way, cultured and educated, to a mass whose inquisitive mind, keen consciousness and creative energy make up the ideomoral, creative potential we rightfully regard as one of the most important achievements of socialism.

Last but no least, this stage also seems to be new because of the changed objectives--as well as forms and methods--of combining scientific socialism with the creativity of the masses. The predominance of communist ideology makes it possible to speak not only about introducing a socialist consciousness among the masses but to speak of its invigoration and about the intensification of this process itself. The party- and nationwide discussion on the pre-congress documents attests to the party's loyalty to the Leninist tradition to constantly advise the people and not only teach them, but also learn from them by drinking from the live spring of the people's initiative. "The participation of the millions upon millions of Soviet people--both communists and non-party members--in the party- and nationwide discussion will make it possible to better adjust the party line in the future, and to take into fuller account the will, interests and needs of all classes and groups within the people," said M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, at the October CPSU Central Committee plenum. This is the historical, social and political purport of the discussion now developing on the pre-congress documents.

The draft new edition of the CPSU Program has delineated the main substance of the three party programs, and has summed up the results of their implementation. While following the first program adopted by the Second Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party in 1903, the proletariat of Russia took political power into its hands and created the first state of workers and peasants in history. The triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution opened a new epoch in the history of mankind. As a result of implementing this program, the Leninist plan for socialist construction has been translated into life, and IN OUR COUNTRY SOCIALISM HAS BECOME A REALITY. The work carried out in implementing the third program adopted by the 22nd CPSU Congress in 1961 was marked by great successes in communist construction, in developing productive forces, economic and social relations, socialist democracy, culture and in shaping a new man. In a complex situation, we have succeeded in achieving a change in the correlation of forces in the world arena in favor of socialism and in approximate military and strategic balance has emerged between the USSR and the United States. This historical achievement has become an important factor of peace and of restraining the forces of aggression of war.

Nearly a quarter of a century has passed since the time when the third program was adopted. The serious economic and social changes that have taken place in the country called for a deep scientific analysis, for a more precise definition of the current and long-term goals, for determining the ways to reach them, and for new attitudes to the party's organizational, socioeconomic and ideological activity. The need to define the programmatic directives more precisely was also dictated by the international situation, by the changes in the deployment of forces in the world arena and in the nature and scales of

the class struggle, of the struggle to secure the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence as a generally accepted norm in relations among states. "In other words," it was noted at the October plenum, "it was necessary not only to sum up the results of what has been done and accomplished, but also to work out a clear and substantiated program for actions in the name of man and peace on earth."

Such a program has for the most part been worked out. THE THIRD CPSU PROGRAM IN ITS PRESENT EDITION IS A PROGRAM FOR THE SYSTEMATIC AND ALL-ROUND IMPROVEMENT OF SOCIALISM AND FOR THE FURTHER ADVANCE OF SOVIET SOCIETY TOWARD COMMUNISM ON THE BASIS OF ACCELERATING THE SOCIOECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE COUNTRY. IT IS A PROGRAM FOR THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE AND SOCIAL PROGRESS.

Materialistic dialectics is the living soul of Marxism-Leninism. This time, too, it serves the party as a reliable instrument in settling complex problems in the sphere of theory and in the sphere of politics, determines the innovative spirit of the draft and provides a basis for all its theses. Assimilating the wealth of ideas contained in the draft and accepting them as a guide to action signifies primarily grasping the revolutionary dialectics of the document. Such an approach toward the study of it is the best means of preventing the scholastic learning by heart of its individual theses, of preventing talk in terms of definitions and of evading the scholastic manipulation of formulas.

In the draft new decision of its third program, our party appears as a worthy successor to the ideas of the socialist transformation of society proclaimed in the "Communist Party Manifesto," a direct successor to the revolutionary traditions of the international proletariat, and to the unfading feat of the heroes of the Paris Commune.

"The main thing in the teaching of Marx," V.I. Lenin wrote, "is the elucidation of the universal historic role of the proletariat as the creator of a socialist society." ("Complete Collected Works," vol 23, p 1) From this consistently class and only scientific point of view, the draft offers in a concentrated form the description of the essence of the present epoch and of the party's activity in the sphere of domestic and foreign policy, and reveals the growing role of the CPSU as the leading force of Soviet society. Not only the Soviet people but also all thinking mankind will find in this document brief and clear answers to the most burning questions of the present time.

The continuity of our party's programmatic, theoretical and political directives is not only a manifestation of the close interconnection among all the founding ideas of Marxism-Leninism and of the loyalty to the revolutionary traditions, but also the reflection of an objective connection between the main stages of universal history, including and above all of the history of socialism as an ideological trend, a social movement, and a social system. Guided by the truly scientific Marxist-Leninist methodology, the party has always defined its programmatic goals, while sharply picking up the course and leading trends of social progress and while constantly holding on to "the red thread binding the entire development of capitalism and the entire path toward socialism..." (V.I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 36, p 47). The ideological integrity, the theoretical clarity and consistency, and the political adherence to

principles of the new edition of the party program result from strict compliance with this methodological instruction of Lenin's.

Marxism-Leninism is an integral revolutionary teaching. And any attempts to split it, to drag it asunder to national quarters, and to oppose Leninism to Marxism are doomed to inevitable failure. Irrefutable evidence of this is the history of our party which, as the draft says, "has always been, is, and will be a party of Marxism-Leninism, a party of revolutionary action."

Equally futile are the attempts of imperialist propaganda to pit against each other the theoretical and political directives of the three party programs, and in particular to present the new edition of the party's main theoretical and political document as a proof of the party program's "insolvency," of its forced "repudiation." In reality the draft clearly shows that THE FUNDAMENTAL THESES OF THE THIRD PROGRAM HAVE BEEN PRESERVED IN ITS NEW EDITION, BECAUSE LIFE HAS CONFIRMED THEIR CORRECTNESS. In enriching and developing these theses, the party has declared its firm resolution to pursue the policy of communist creation.

At all stages of its history, our party has proceeded from the point that a "broadly principled policy is the only really practical policy" (V.I. LENIN, op. cit., vol 15, p 368). And such a consistent class policy based on the general law of historical development does not waive principles for the sake of an instant, ephemeral advantage, and does not sacrifice the final goals and international interests of the communist movement for temporary particular considerations. A principled policy is the science and the art of steadily pursuing the theoretically substantiated and practically adjusted general line throughout all the "zigzags" of history. A principled policy is a realistic policy built on a sober analysis of reality in its entire complexity and contradictoriness, a policy taking into account both the positive and negative phenomena of public life. A principled policy is a creative policy that controls circumstances and not one that adapts itself to them. It is a flexible policy, irreconcilably hostile to routine and stagnation, a policy taking into account the entire variety of the present world's realities, a policy respecting the opinions and ideas of the other parties that represent various streams of the workers movement. "But as far as the revolutionary essence of Marxism-Leninism, the essence and role of real socialism are concerned, the CPSU, from principled positions will continue to rebuff opportunism and reformism, dogmatism and factionalism. This also determines the CPSU's attitude to any attempts to deprive the activity of the communists of its class purport, and to distort the revolutionary nature of the goals and means of the struggle to achieve these goals." These lines from the draft confirm with the new strength both our party's preparedness to ally itself and reach agreements with other democratic and peace-loving forces in the name of common goals, and its firm resolve to guard its philosophical and political independence. We will continue to strictly follow Lenin's behest: "...No practical alliances with other factions of revolutionaries must lead to compromise and concessions in the theory, the program, or the banner" (op. cit., vol 2, p 450).

Continuity in its Leninist interpretation does not rule out but, on the contrary, proposes the development and enrichment of theory and policy with



new principled conclusions in line with accumulated experience and changed social conditions; it proposes a critical revision of formulas which did not pass the test of time.

IN THE NEW EDITION OF THE CPSU PROGRAM THE CORE OF THE THINGS WHICH ENRICH MARXISM-LENINISM, THE THEORY OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM AND THE STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF THE PARTY IS REPRESENTED BY THE LARGE-SCALE CONCEPT OF ACCELERATING THE COUNTRY'S SOCIOECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND, ON THIS BASIS, REACHING A QUALITATIVELY NEW STATE OF SOVIET SOCIETY. Precisely this concept offers a key to comprehension of the essence of the problems that have merged, a key to elaborating the ways and methods of settling them. This concept substantiates the strategic directions of the work performed by the party, the Soviet state and all people, proceeding from the realities of the present day and of the country's communist future. The concept of acceleration is the main thing that the party has now offered to the people and with which it goes to its 27th congress. This is the backbone of the three documents now submitted for the party-wide and nationwide discussion. The acceleration of our advance in all tasks, both great and small--this is the leading idea which should determine the entire development of the discussions on the pregress documents, and which should turn into the political slogan of the day. Put forward by the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee plenum, and thoroughly worked out by the party in the wake of its routine congress, the concept of acceleration accurately conveys--both scientifically and politically--the feeling of expecting deep changes, a feeling that has been determining the atmosphere of our public life with growing clarity.

The new draft edition of the program, the draft amendments to the party statutes and the draft main guidelines for the economic and social development of the USSR in the 12th 5-year period and up to the year 2000 have taken full account of everything that has enriched our sociopolitical practice in recent years. Before the concept of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development was worked out, the party carried out great and intense theoretical work to define more precisely the level of socioeconomic maturity reached by our society, to orient itself in real historical time which works in favor of full communism. The multiform work of the party's collective thinking has been summed up in the brief and capacious formula of the new edition of the CPSU Program: "The country has entered the state of developed socialism." The concept of developed socialism has made it possible to see more clearly the multidimensionality and complexity of the task put on the agenda for the all-round improvement of socialist society, and for making every fuller and effective use of its possibilities and advantages.

The party program is a theoretical and political document whose purpose is not at all restricted to fixation of the status reached by society. "...In the program we must state both what there is and what we intend to do? (V.I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 36, p 55). The new edition of the program theoretically substantiates the ways and means of purposefully changing the existing state of affairs, the intentional intense striving forwards, and it defines the party's strategy under the new conditions. The concept of accelerating our society's concept of developed socialism is in a state of direct continuity with the concept of developed socialism; it defines more precisely and concretely, and interprets the latter in a new way. A CHARACTERISTIC FEATURE OF THE CONCEPT OF THE ACCELERATION IS THE FACT THAT IT PUTS EMPHASIS NOT ON

THE DEGREE OF DEVELOPMENT (OR MATURITY) REACHED BY A SOCIALIST SOCIETY--A GREAT DEAL HAS BEEN SAID AND WRITTEN ON THIS TOPIC IN RECENT TIMES--BUT ON THE NEED FOR ITS ALL-ROUND DYNAMIC ADVANCE ALONG ALL LINES OF COMMUNIST CREATION; NOT ON THE CONTEMPLATION OF WHAT HAS BEEN ACHIEVED, BUT ON ENERGETIC AND URGENT ACTION.

An important feature of the new edition of the party program lay in its clear and undeviating COMMUNIST ORIENTATION. "Our party's name," Lenin used to say, "shows with sufficient clarity that we go to full communism" (ibid p 66). At the October CPSU Central Committee plenum, in full conformity with Lenin, it was pointed out that: "We firmly head for communism, proceeding from the point that between the two stages of uniform communist formation there is not, and cannot be, an abrupt verge."

The draft program clearly and in a well-considered way deals with the cardinal questions of Marxist-Leninist teaching about the development of communist socioeconomic formation, and about the ways of transition to its higher stage.

The draft more amply and capaciously describes socialism as a social system possessing indisputable socioeconomic, political, ideological and moral advantages over capitalism, as a society bearing on its banner the slogan "Everything for Man, Everything for Man's Benefit." In formulating the tasks of the CPSU for improving socialism, the draft draws up a communist future, strictly following Lenin's instructions to shun superfluous details and indulgence in groundless fantasies about things no one knows. More perfectly aware than ever how dangerous it is to anticipate facts, to skip over historically necessary stages of social progress, the party realistically and within the lines of the concretely foreseeable future, formulates tasks for improving socialism and for a gradual transition to communism.

At the same time, while resolutely resisting all sorts of marking time and sluggishness in the settling of imminent problems, the party sets the task of accelerating the socioeconomic development of society. Point one: This task has been dictated by the need to overcome the adverse trends and difficulties in the country's development in the seventies and early eighties which hindered the increasingly full use of the enormous potential opportunities of the socialist system. Point two: The purport of this task is to ensure a qualitatively new condition of Soviet society, to fully reveal the advantages of socialism in all spheres of life, and to consolidate the Universal Communist Principles, which in reality will signify our country's further advance toward communism.

In connection with this the draft refers to Lenin's idea of "integral communism" set forth in his work "On Left-wing Infantism and Petit Bourgeois Mentality." History, he notes in this work, took such a particular turn that "in 1918 it gave birth to two separate halves of socialism." In Lenin's words, "Germany and Russia embodied in 1918 in the most graphic way the materialization of production and socioeconomic conditions for socialism, on the one hand, and the political conditions of socialism, on the other." As a result of this, as Lenin then supposed, "integral socialism" would arise "from revolutionary cooperation among the proletarians of ALL countries" (see op. cit., vol 36, pp 300, 306).

It would be wrong to consider that the concept of "integrality" implies only the international aspects of the construction of socialism or the sum total of the various attempts to embody it, each of these attempts being more or less "unilateral" according to Lenin's ideas. When speaking of "integral socialism," Lenin had in mind all the necessary material and political conditions for the "introduction" of the new system. In Russia in 1918 there was only a proportion--the decisive proportion, it is true--of these conditions. At that moment the sum total of these could only develop revolution in the developed countries of Europe. History, however, moved in such a direction that we had to combine the two "halves" of socialism by ourselves, creating--in the course of the nationalization of land, factories and plants, of the industrialization of the country, of the collectivism of agriculture, and of the cultural revolution--all that Lenin called the preparations "for the material-production 'introduction' of socialism," (ibid, p 306) and all that makes it possible for socialism to develop on its own basis. With the formation of the world socialist system and in time with the consolidation of the community of fraternal countries, this basis for has become even broader and more powerful. The internal and international conditions for the construction of "integral socialism" have moved even closer together. This construction has become a completely foreseeable, completely visible future and a task which has been transferred from the sphere of theory to the sphere of practice. As such, this task is a most essential element of the draft new edition of the party program.

Overcoming a certain "one-sided" nature of the country's development, when we were forced to rush ahead in some sectors and delay in others, the acceleration of our society's socioeconomic progress will give us both a greater degree of independence from attendant circumstances which lie outside the nature of socialism and which in fact conditioned this historical "unilateral" nature, and also great scope for revealing the enormous essential potential of the new system. In a certain sense, the extensive factors of economic growth should also be counted among these external circumstances. Their exhaustion and the shift to an intensive path of development, apart from everything else, mean that the development of socialism in our country will to an increasing extent be implemented and accelerated through the potential internally inherent in it and through the revelation and resolution of the nonantagonistic contradictions peculiar to it. The acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development has nothing in common with "urging it on" in an artificial and voluntarist manner. In complete accordance with the materialist concept of history, the party treats the acceleration of social progress as an objective, historically natural process which presupposes, in an equally natural and law-governed manner, an increase in the role of the subjective factor, meaning primarily a rise in the level of scientific interpretation of the specific features of the socialist social system, of political leadership of society, and of management of the national economy, as well as a growth in the awareness of all citizens. In other words, the country's progress will depend to an immeasurably greater extent than ever before on ourselves, on our initiative and skill, on our discipline and organization, that is, on all that we understand today as the activation of the human factor. Socialism's achievement of integrality and the intensification of all spheres of life are two sides of the single process of our society's advance toward a new qualitative state. The characterization of



the parameters of this process is of principled importance for an understanding of the deep essence of CPSU strategy, which is aimed at perfecting socialism and at a gradual shift to communism.

In the economic sphere, the advance to new qualitative frontiers will mean the rise of the national economy to a fundamentally new scientific-technical and organizational-economic level; a shift of the economy to the track of intensive development; the achievement of the highest world level of labor productivity, product quality, and effectiveness of social production; the ensuring of an optimal structure and balance of the country's unified national economic complex; a considerable increase in the degree of socialization of work and production; the drawing together of kolkhoz-collective ownership and all-people's ownership, with the prospect of their fusion.

In the social sphere this means the ensuring of a qualitatively new level of national welfare, while consistently implementing the socialist principle "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his work;" the creation of a basically classless structure in society and the elimination of existing socioeconomic and cultural everyday differences between town and country; the increasingly organic combination of physical and mental work in production activity; the further cohesion of the Soviet people as a social and international community; the upsurge in the creative energy and initiative of the masses.

In the political sphere, reaching qualitatively new frontiers presupposes the development of socialist self-government by the people through the increasingly full involvement of citizens in administering state and social affairs, through improving the activity of the elective organs of people's power, broadening publicity, increasing the role of trade unions, of the Komsomol, and of other mass organizations of working people, and effectively utilizing all forms of representative and direct democracy.

In the sphere of the spiritual life, the advance to new frontiers is connected with the further consolidation of socialist ideology in the awareness of Soviet people, with the establishment in our life of the moral principles of socialism, the spirit of collectivism, and comradely mutual assistance, with the familiarization of the very broadest masses of the population with scientific achievements and cultural treasures, and with the formations of a comprehensively developed individual.

The new contributions made by the party to the theory of scientific socialism have found concentrated expressions in the draft which is being discussed today. In this connection, it is impossible not to see that at the qualitatively new stage of development the main features of socialism as a social system are in full accordance with the ideas about its essential nature developed by Marx, Engels and Lenin, with real historical trends, and with the course of contemporary history. The most important principle of dialectic-materialistic methodology--THE PRINCIPLE OF THE UNITY OF THE LOGICAL AND HISTORICAL-- has found concrete embodiment here.

It is extraordinarily important that this circumstance be stressed because the unjustified separation of theoretical thought from reality, this thought's

jumping over necessary historical stages, and its lagging behind the course of real historical processes, all of which is expressed by transferring the solutions of the problems of the socialist phase to the period of complete communism, are all based on one common error, which is that of forgetting the above methodological principle. Forgetting this principle has made itself felt, for example, in the diffuse interpretation in its time of the question of achieving the highest world level of labor productivity in the first stage of communism, in the interpretation of contradictions under socialism and of ways of forming a classless structure of society, and in the fate of the Leninist idea of self-government, which on some occasions has been identified with its anarcho-syndicalist interpretation, and on others with communist social self-government, as a result of which theoretical thought has seemed not to notice its already existing socialist forms.

It is important to fully recognize another lesson--the moral lesson--which history has taught the representatives of social science. For many years some social scientists have preferred to remain calmly in the rearguard, as they say, not considering it their duty to see and recognize those processes, those shifts in social life and those tasks advanced by social life, all of which are today fixed with certainty in the provisions of the draft new edition of the party program. It is worth leafing through the publications of the recent past in order to become convinced that the scientific thought of some sociologists has on occasion disoriented social practice. However, it is no secret that the authors of dubious but stubbornly defended recommendations have borne no moral responsibility to either science or society in this connection. The state of scientific criticism has contributed to this to a considerable extent. Serving the truth is incompatible with the existence in science of "protected zones", of names, degrees and titles not subject to criticism, just as persecuting people for criticism or completely ignoring criticism is incompatible with both scientific and party ethics. Today, such phenomena are particularly intolerable. It stands to reason that no one is protected against errors. But in all periods it has been an elementary moral norm for a scientist to publicly admit his own mistakes and the inaccuracies he has committed. And no worker in science and no scientific collective have the right to consider themselves insured against a critical analysis of their work!

Supporting a bold search, the competition of ideas and directions in science, and a fruitful discussion, the party calls on sociologists to concentrate their efforts on study and comprehensive analysis of the experience of world development, of the creation of a new society in the USSR and other socialist countries, of the dialectics of production forces and production relations, of the material and spiritual spheres in the conditions of socialism, of the natural laws of communist formation and of ways and means of gradually moving toward the highest phase of this formation. An urgent task of the social sciences at the contemporary stage is scientific analysis of the objective contradictions of socialist society and the development of well-founded recommendations for solving them and of reliable economic and social prognoses.

The decisive sphere of human activity and the material basis of the qualitative renewal of all aspects of the life of society is the economy.

Complete and immediate utilization of the intensive factors of economic growth by each enterprise, each branch, and the national economic complex as a whole is expected even by the end of the second millennium to ensure that the country's production potential is doubled, while simultaneously undergoing a fundamental qualitative transformation. The main level of this transformation is the cardinal acceleration of scientific-technical progress, on the basis of which a new technical reconstruction of the national economy is to be carried out. The postulation of this task is dictated by both the internal and international situation and corresponds to the nature of socialism and its historical mission.

Marx, Engels and Lenin all linked the destiny of communist civilization indissolubly to scientific-technical progress which transforms society's material basis, and to the transformation of science into a direct production force. The elucidation of the proletariat's world historical role also presupposes the elucidation of its role in scientific-technical progress, of which it is expected to be the bearer and the implementer. There is no social force in the world other than the workers class and there is no party in the world other than the party of scientific communism, the party of social revolution, which has so indissolubly linked its destiny to that of the scientific-technical revolution. Lenin's words are received as a valuable lesson now, too: "...An economist must always look ahead in the direction of technical progress, or else he will rapidly become out-of-date, because whoever does not want to look forward is turning back on history: there is and can be no middle ground here." (op. cit., vol 5, pp 137-138)

The scientific-technical revolution is inseparable from the social organization of the world. IT IS PRECISELY THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION OF THE PROLETARIAT WHICH CREATES THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH THE ENORMOUS AND EVER INCREASING SCIENTIFIC -TECHNICAL POWER BECOMES THAT WHICH IS OUGHT TO BE ACCORDING TO ITS HISTORICAL DESTINY--A PRODUCTIVE, NOT DESTRUCTIVE, AND A CREATIVE, NOT RUINOUS FORCE IN MAN'S HANDS. It is precisely such a revolution that places the creations of man's mind and hands at his service, while capital turns them against him. It is precisely the social revolution that lends integrality to scientific-technical progress, strengthening and optimizing the link between its material-technical and socioeconomic aspects and between the relations of man to nature and man to man.

The Marxist-Leninist political vocabulary contains a precise word which expresses this link synonymously: SOCIALIZATION. The establishment and perfecting of socialist norms of social life and the socialization of work and production--socialization which is not formal but practical, or as Lenin said, socialization in practice--are inseparable from the development of the scientific-technical revolution. This development presupposes the conducting of a unified scientific-technical policy, the planned transformation of the technical and technological bases of production, the increasing "thickening" of the diverse links [svyaz] existing within the framework of the unified national economic framework, strengthening and augmenting of socialist ownership, which forms the basis of the formation of a classless structure of society, of the effacement of the existing differences between town and country and between physical and mental work, of the intensification of the creative content and collectivist nature of that work, of the further

prospering and drawing together of nations, and in the distant historical perspective, of the achievement of their complete unity. It is precisely on the basis of these changes that socialist democracy and the people's socialist self-government are being developed, as is the Soviet people's culture, which is socialist in content, national in form, internationalist in spirit, and unified and diverse in its manifestations. The strengthening of collectivist and general communist principles in the life of socialist society is indissolubly connected with raising the level of real socialization.

The struggle for the comprehensive intensification and rationalization of production and for its high degree of effectiveness is, according to the draft new edition of the CPSU Program, organically combined with the implementation of Soviet society's humanist aims, with full employment, and with the steady improvement of all aspects of people's lives, in the conditions of the socialist planned economic system. The perfecting of production relations and the maintenance of their persistent correspondence to the dynamically developing production forces presupposes further improvement of the relations of distribution and also the intensification of collective and personal interest in the progress of social production. In realizing the program aims of the party, it is vitally necessary to place a reliable barrier against unearned incomes, against leveling in the remuneration of work and against all that is contrary to the norms of principles of socialist society and to the idea of SOCIAL JUSTICE.

The party regards social policy as a powerful means of accelerating the country's development, of raising the work and sociopolitical activeness of the masses, the formation of a new person and the establishment of a socialist way of life, and as an important factor in the political stability of society. The intensification of the role of social policy is directly dictated by the highest aim, of communist construction, that is, by the achievement of the "full welfare and free comprehensive development of all members of society," as Lenin wrote (op. cit., vol 6, p 232). It is planned to double the volume of resources allocated to satisfying the people's needs in the next 15 years. The basic areas of the party's work in the social sphere cover the entire expanse of man's life, from the conditions of his work and everyday life, health and leisure, to social and national relations. In this connection the increase in national welfare must occur in strict accordance with the achieved level of development of production forces and with the volume and quality of the work of all members of society.

The draft new edition of the party program emphasizes that a leading role in the development of social relations belongs to the workers class, whose political experience, high degree of awareness, organization and will power and growth in cultural professional level and in social activeness make for its decisive influence on the course of social processes and of communist construction as a whole.

The main instrument of perfecting socialism is the socialist all-people's state. Having played the decisive role in the creation of a new society and having fulfilled its historical mission, the dictatorship of the proletariat has grown into a political organization of all working people. This historical fact embodied one of the most important forecasts of scientific

socialism, the founders of which stated that the socialist state will no longer be an instrument of oppression and suppression of the majority by the minority, but that it would rather be a "semi-state" representing the interests at first of the absolute majority, and later those of all working people and the entire people.

As has already been noted, in comprehensively revealing the strategy for the development of our country's political system, the draft new edition of the program restores the rights of THE LENINIST IDEA OF SOCIALIST SELF-GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE, which is one of the most important ideas in scientific socialism, and develops and enriches it in application to contemporary conditions.

The essence of the principle of socialist self-government is that government should not only be carried out in the interests of the working people, but that naturally and step by step it should become the immediate affair of working people themselves, who know no power above themselves other than that of their own association (see op. cit., vol 39, p 17). The leading force of this progress is the party, the nucleus of our society's political system, a system in which certain important features of future communist social self-government are already visible today.

"The development of genuine people's power," M.S. Gorbachev stated at the October CPSU Central Committee plenum, "is acquiring even greater significance today, when we are setting about solving the most complex tasks in the sphere of production, culture and government. Every real step in the expansion of publicity, in the intensification of control from below and in the deepening of democratic principles in the activity of all state and social organizations is valuable. In short, we need to make maximum use of the democratic nature of socialism and of its vital need to be nurtured on the creativity of the masses."

The scale of this creativity depends to a considerable extent on the set-up of ideological work. What is involved is that full use should be made of the creative force of Marxist-Leninist ideology in order to mobilize the working people. The draft new edition of the Program reveals the party's tasks of forming a scientific world outlook, of work education, of establishing communist morality, of patriotic, international and atheist education and of the struggle against bourgeois ideology. This document particularly stresses the necessity of striving for the organic fusion of the ideological influence on the masses with the expansion of their social activeness and with all possible consolidation of the unit of the honest word and the real deed.

In outlining the contours of a future society and revealing the mechanism of its progress, K. Marx already wrote that with the fall of the system of capitalist exploitation it will be possible for the first time for movement to exist of which the main content is the totally unconfined development of human forces as such, a development which will be a universal consequence of social progress. Following the logic of the founders of scientific socialism, the party states today that it is possible to achieve an activation of the human factor only through a well-considered economic strategy, a strong social policy and purposeful ideological-educational work taken as an indissoluble



whole. Without this it is impossible to solve a single one of the tasks advanced by the preCongress documents.

The draft new edition of the CPSU Program is a document of enormous international significance. Completely in accord with the real picture of the contemporary world and the class struggle in the international arena, the document characterizes the main motive forces of social development. The mass democratic movements in the non-socialist world, which have greatly gained in scope in recent years and have become an important factor of political life, are ranked among these forces side by side with world socialism, the workers and communist movement and the peoples of liberated states.

Progressive forces see our party program as an expression of the invariable solidarity of the CPSU and the Soviet people with their just struggle, and as evidence of respect for their views and aspirations and of determination to further the consolidation of unity of all movements against imperialism and reaction and for peace and social progress. Precisely the interaction of the leading forces of the contemporary period --real socialism, the international workers and communist movement, dozens of young independent states, and the broad antiwar democratic movements--determine the general direction of world development in our era. Marxist-Leninist science characterizes this era, initiated by the triumphant October Revolution, as the era of transition of from capitalism to socialism and communism on a worldwide scale.

The complete and final victory of socialism in the USSR, the great successes of the Soviet people in the economy, in social and political spheres, and in science and culture which have now brought our country to new historical frontiers, the transformation of socialism into a world system, and the formation and consolidation of the socialist community which has resulted in a fundamental change in the correlation of forces in the international arena to the advantage of the peoples struggling for social progress, democracy, national freedom and peace--all this represents incontrovertible proof that the revolutionizing creative influence of the October Revolution on the course of world history has not only not run out but, on the contrary, is ever growing. Briefly, in our program "we are not raising the torch of social revolution merely in the sense of an agitation speech." (V.I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 36, p 49)

The light of the October Revolution enables us to perceive more sharply the facts and trends of social life, the state and evolution of contemporary capitalism and the role of form of the present workers class that has been and continues to be the vanguard of the liberation movement and of all forces of the world revolutionary process. The conclusion incorporated in the draft new edition of the program--that the application of science to production is supplementing the ranks of the workers class with representatives of intellectual work--is of principled importance. This conclusion not only refutes the conjectures of our class enemies about an alleged decline in the role of workers class in contemporary capitalist society and about the extinction of the proletariat's influence in social processes but, on the contrary, attests to the further growth of this role and influence.

The problems that are troubling all mankind and, first and foremost, the problem of preservation and consolidation of peace appear before us more graphically and clearly in the light of the October Revolution. Appraising the increased potential of the forces of peace and progress, the party has confirmed the principled conclusion that, however great the threat to peace created by the policy of the aggressive circles of imperialism may be, the fatal inevitability of a world war does not exist. It is possible to prevent war and save mankind from a catastrophe. It is precisely in this that socialism sees its historic mission, socialism that has brought with it the only reasonable and acceptable method of coexistence of states with different social systems and has shown the way to establishing an international system which would make it possible to direct the results of the work of people exclusively toward creative purposes. The historical mission of all progressive, peace-loving forces on our planet also lies precisely in this.

The policy of the most reactionary forces of imperialism is a policy of the most rigid opposition to social progress. The aim of that policy is to achieve social revanche on a worldwide scale. Vigilance against the intrigues of reaction, a sober approach in assessing the correlation of forces in the world arena, together with firm faith in the future and concern for strengthening the unity and cohesion of all international detachments of fighters for peace and social progress is what forms the basis of the Soviet Union's foreign policy.

We also raise high the torch of October in our foreign policy. A WORLD WITHOUT WARS AND WITHOUT WEAPONS--THIS IS THE IDEAL OF SOCIALISM. In the socialist society there are no classes and no social or professional groups that would be interested in war. This is an indisputable historical fact. Just as foreign policy is inseparable from domestic policy, so is creation incompatible with military preparations. Maintaining the might of the USSR Armed Forces at the level that precludes strategic superiority of imperialism, and raising our defense capability to higher levels represent a vital necessity for socialism. This is a most important concern of the CPSU and the Soviet state--which is dictated by the extreme reaction's threat of unleashing a thermonuclear world war--and their sacred duty to the workers class and the people.

"THE CPSU SOLEMNLY DECLARES: THERE IS NO WEAPON WHICH THE SOVIET UNION WOULD NOT BE READY TO LIMIT OR BAN ON A MUTUAL BASIS AND WITH THE APPLICATION OF EFFECTIVE VERIFICATION." Only those who are deaf cannot hear these responsible words and only unconscionable politicians can pretend that they doubt their sincerity and honesty. These are the words of the main theoretical and political document of the Communist Party, words whose truthfulness has not been verified only by past experience but also by real deeds of the present time and by initiatives of the CPSU and the Soviet state persistently supporting a broad and constructive program of measures aimed at ending the arms race, at disarmament, at preventing the militarization of outer space and at ensuring peace and the security of peoples.

The CPSU has traversed a road that is unprecedented in the depth and force of its effect on social development. At every stage of the history of the land of the soviets it has won--with its deeds and with its heroism and its

wholehearted devotion to the ideals of communism and the interests of the working people--the right to be society's leading and directing force. Guarding the Leninist legacy as sacred, it has been and continues to be the main generating force of new ideas and the inspirer and organizer of historical creativity of the masses. Having come into being and developed as the party of the workers class and having remained at such in its class essence and ideology, it has now become the party of all people.

In the contemporary conditions, the draft new edition of the Program notes, THE PARTY'S LEADING ROLE IN THE LIFE OF SOVIET SOCIETY IS INCREASING IN A LAW-GOVERNED WAY. This is conditioned, among other things, also by the growing scale and more complicated nature of the society's political system, by a deepening of its democratic nature, and by the need for further creative enrichment of Marxist-Leninist theory and for a search for answers to the extraordinarily complicated questions brought forward by the entire course of social progress. This is further conditioned by the interests of strengthening the community of socialist countries and of consolidating the unity of the international communist and workers and the national liberation movements. And finally, this is conditioned by the complicated nature of the international situation and by the need to find solutions which would make it possible to curb the forces of aggression and release mankind from the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

The complex of ideas called upon to determine the development of the party and the raising of the level of political leadership and of activities of its organizations and each individual communist is linked into one whole in the draft new edition of the CPSU Program by the idea that THE PARTY EXISTS FOR THE PEOPLE AND SEES THE MEANING OF ITS ACTIVITY IN SERVICE TO THE PEOPLE. This also determines the demands which it makes on its organizations and members.

Asserting the Leninist style in its work and in the practice of the organs of state and economic administration, the CPSU will continue to follow the tested Leninist principles of democratic centralism, party membership, work with cadres, collective leadership and proletarian and socialist internationalism. It attaches primary importance to the unity of ideological-theoretical, political-educational, organizational and economic activity, the iron discipline of its ranks and an uncompromising struggle against stagnation and conservatism. In developing internal party democracy, it will persistently struggle for the honest and pure image of every party member, it will persistently struggle for the honest and pure image of every party member. Combining trust toward cadres with exactingness toward them and with increasing their personal responsibility, the Party establishes a system within which no single organization and no single worker would remain uncontrolled. THE UNBREAKABLE IDEOLOGICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL COHESION OF THE PARTY IS THE MOST IMPORTANT SOURCE OF ITS STRENGTH AND INVINCIBILITY.

The draft amendments to the CPSU Statute, the basic law of the life of communists, are now discussed by party organizations simultaneously with the draft new edition of the program. The proposed amendments are fully in accord with the propositions of the new edition of the Program and are enriching the



Statute with the experience accumulated in the party buildup and in organizational and political work.

The detailed formulation of the obligations of communists, the improvement of the system of admission to the CPSU, the expansion of the rights of primary party organizations, the further democratization of internal party relations, and the perfecting of mutual relations between the party and the state and social organizations--all this will definitely strengthen it organizationally, intensify the creative activeness of communists and their responsibility for the tasks assigned to them and, in the final analysis, will enhance the Party's leading role in socialist society.

The draft new edition of the CPSU Program and the draft amendments introduced in the CPSU Statute are documents with a long-term effect. Thus, the communists must show all the greater initiative and responsibility in their approach to studying these documents and their discussion must be all the more creative. Every line of these documents call--to use Lenin's words--for "working tirelessly to establish discipline and self-discipline and always and everywhere to strengthen organization, order, efficiency and the harmonious cooperation of all-people's forces...." (op. cit., vol 36, p 80) It can be asserted with complete confidence that the Soviet people will accept the tasks formulated in the preCongress party documents as their very own tasks and will spare no efforts to accomplish them.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". Kommunist", 1985

CSO: 1802/5-F

M.S. GORBACHEV PRESS CONFERENCE AT THE SOVIET PRESS CENTER IN GENEVA 21  
NOVEMBER 1985

PM221027 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 85 (signed to press 28 Nov 85)  
pp 17-30

[Text] Our talks with the President of the United States of America, the first in 6.5 years, have just ended. This is undoubtedly a significant event in international life. The significance of the meeting will become even clearer if you bear in mind not only Soviet-U.S. relations, but also international relations in general, which are going through a special and, I would say, difficult period.

First, a few words about what went before the Geneva meeting. It was awaited impatiently throughout the world. People pinned great hopes on it for the improvement of the world situation and the lessening of international tension, which is reaching a dangerous level. True doubts were also expressed: as to whether the confrontation between the two powers had gone too far for it to be possible to count on any accords at all. All this was the case and you know it as well as we do.

As for the Soviet side, the Soviet Union, we were well aware of the real situation and did not entertain the slightest illusions about U.S. policy. We saw how far the militarization of the economy and even of political thinking had gone in that country.

But we were well aware that the situation in the world is too dangerous to neglect even the slightest chance of rectifying the situation and advancing toward a more stable and lasting peace.

Even during the run-up, for several months before the meeting, we had already begun, so to speak, to pave the way to the meeting and create a favorable climate for it. Back in the summer we unilaterally halted all nuclear explosions, expressing the readiness to resume talks immediately on completely ending nuclear tests. We also confirmed the unilateral moratorium on testing antisatellite weapons and, as you know, put forward radical proposals for reducing nuclear arsenals. Our proposals to prevent the arms race from being transferred to space were accompanied by proposals on launching the broadest possible international cooperation on the peaceful explorations and use of space for the good of all the peoples.

I repeat, we did everything possible to lay the foundations for mutual understanding and improve the political atmosphere even before the meeting. During the run-up to the Geneva summit meeting, a session of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee was held in Sofia, at which the voice of the socialist countries rang out strongly in defense of peace, the relaxation of tension, and cooperation, against the arms race, against confrontation and for the improvement of the international situation in the interests of all the earth's peoples.

And although these steps of ours, dictated by a sense of responsibility for the fate of peace, did not meet with a due response from our partners in the forthcoming talks in Geneva, we adhered firmly to a constructive position. We considered it necessary to try by force of arguments, by force of example, by force of common sense, to break the dangerous course of events. The very complexity of the international situation convinced us that a direct conversation with the U.S. President is necessary. By virtue of the enormous role which both the Soviet Union and the United States play, there naturally arises the enormous responsibility of these states and their political leaders. This was our conclusion: The time has come when, under the threat of the universal nuclear danger, it is necessary to learn the great art of living together. Both our Soviet people and, I am profoundly convinced, the U.S. people have an equal interest in this. All the peoples of the world have an interest in it.

We were and are aware of the mood of the peoples in all countries in favor of peace, their desire not only to preserve peace, but also to improve the situation and achieve real progress in the struggle to end the arms race. This desire is growing and is of tremendous significance. Two significant conclusions can be drawn from it.

On the one hand--and this was a source of inspiration to us--what we are doing meets the hopes and aspirations of vast masses of people in the world, regardless of where they live or what political views, religious convictions, or traditions they have. On the other hand, it was not only a source of inspiration, it also imposed great obligations on us, above all an obligation to responsibility.

How can the present stage in the development of the international situation be characterized? To put it concisely: Growing responsibility is understood by the peoples, and they are acting in the ways available to them.

It follows from this that this situation, this characterization must nurture the policy of states and the practical actions of politicians. The absence of a policy adequate to the urgent needs felt by all the peoples of the world cannot be made good by propagandist packaging. The peoples have now learned to understand everything quickly and to put everything in its place.

That is my profound conviction. I and my colleagues in the Soviet Union and in the country's political leadership, seeing the situation in precisely that way, have focused our attention in a constructive direction, on the quest for ways to a better, more tranquil world.

The letters I have received from the Soviet Union, the United States, Australia, Europe, Asia and Africa have made a tremendous impression on me-- letters from children, women, men, veterans. It is important to stress that the young people of the whole planet have also actively raised their voice in these letters. Those to whom the future belongs, those who are embarking on life, are taking on their shoulders the responsibility for the future of the world.

Now for the meeting itself.

A considerable place was occupied by face-to-face conversations with President Reagan. Just now, when the U.S. President and I said good-bye, we wanted to count how many times we met one-to-one. We arrived at a figure of five or six. As a rule they were hour-long conversations, sometimes longer. That is not merely arithmetic. The meetings were frank, prolonged, and blunt--at times extremely blunt [ostryy]. Nonetheless, it seems to me, they were to some extent productive. Of course, considerably more time was devoted to them than planned. I would say that they occupied most of the time during these two days.

This enabled us to discuss a wide range of problems fact to face. The conversations took place in the language of politics, an open, forthright language and I think that this was not only of great significance but, I would say, decisive.

Above all, at these conversations, and also at the plenary sessions and in broad contacts between all members of the delegations and experts at the corresponding levels--and they were represented on the Soviet and U.S. sides by people of authority, well known not only in our countries, but throughout the world--all this taken together made it possible to do substantial work in the 2 days.

We presented to the President our considerations, our evaluation of the world situation. The starting point of our analysis is this: In recent decades radical changes have taken place in the world which require a new approach, a fresh look at many things in foreign policy. The present international situation is characterized by a very important feature which both we and the United States must take into account in our foreign policy. What I mean is this: In present conditions it is not only a question of confrontation between the two social systems, but of a choice between survival and mutual destruction.

In other words, the objective course of the world process itself places the questions of war and peace, questions of survival, at the center of world politics. I wish to stress that I am specially using the word "survival" not in order to dramatize the situations and inspire fear, but in order to ensure that we all feel deeply and are aware of the realities of today's world.

The problem of war and peace is a priority problem, a burning issue which affects the interests of all of us who live on earth. I would like to stress that this problem has moved to the center of world politics. We cannot avoid seeking solutions to this vital problem. We are convinced of that. That is

the Soviet people's will, that is the will of the U.S. people and of all peoples. That is the first thing.

The second thing: Again we drew the U.S. side's attention to the following circumstances--of which I have already spoken. They are circumstances of such importance, and we attach such major significance to them, that we deemed it necessary to speak of them again at the Geneva meeting; namely, it is a fact that even now it is very difficult for us to embark on a productive dialogue and talks on questions of ending the arms race and nuclear disarmament. Tomorrow it will be even more difficult to do so.

That is why the meeting was necessary and responsible dialogue was necessary. We have all reached the point where we have to stop, look around, think, and on the basis of the realities, on the basis of a broad approach to the definition of national interests, decide what to do next in the world. In the course of the meetings and conversations, I wished to understand what is the present U.S. Administration's position on this cardinal question--the questions of war and peace.

We have all read a great deal about this. And you journalists, in general, have also said a great deal on this score. But for those who take the decisions, it is important to understand the initial, starting point in the formation of our partner's policy, the initial idea behind the present U.S. Administration's foreign policy. Much work and effort were required in order to evaluate everything without prejudice, with a great sense of responsibility, taking a broad view, and to find an answer to this very important question.

This analysis showed us that for all the difference in the side's approaches and the evaluations which were revealed in the course of this serious and necessary work--without having done it, we could not have gone to the meeting--we saw that we have, it seems to me, something in common which could form the starting point for an improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations: the awareness that nuclear war is impermissible, that it must not be waged, and that there can be no winners in such a war. This idea was expressed more than once both on our side and on the U.S. side. The conclusion that follows from this is that the central problem in relations between our countries at the present stage is the problem of security. We resolutely advocate that agreements be reached ensuring identical security for both countries.

We believe that on this basis it will be possible to achieve a consistent strengthening of mutual trust, an overall improvement of the political atmosphere, in which it is possible to hope for the development of a political dialogue and the fruitful discussion of economic and humanitarian problems, problems of contacts and mutual information. This is the key to the problem of preserving life on earth and changing the atmosphere in the direction of good will.

We told the president that we have not sought and will not strive for military superiority over the United States. Moreover, more than once, face to face and at the plenary sessions, I tried to express our profound conviction that a lower level of security for the United States compared with the Soviet Union would be disadvantageous to us, because it would lead to distrust and give

rise to instability. We are counting on a similar U.S. approach as regards our country. At the same time we told the President that in no event will we permit the United States to obtain military superiority over us. It seems to me that this is a logical way of putting it. Both sides must get used to strategic parity by mutual efforts; in other words, to implement real measures to reduce nuclear arms on a reciprocal basis. That is a field of activity worthy of the leaders of such great states as the Soviet Union and the United States and of other state leaders, since it is a common issue for us.

But another conclusion of fundamental significance also arises quite logically from this. Neither of us, neither the United States nor the Soviet Union, should do anything to open the doors to an arms race in new spheres, specifically in space. If the doors into space were opened for weapons, the scale of military rivalry would increase immeasurably and the arms race would--this can already be predicted to some extent--take on an irreversible character and get out of control. In this case each side would at any moment have the feeling that it is losing in some respect and it would start feverishly seeking more and more new ways of responding; and that would whip up the arms race all the time, not only in space, but also on earth, since the responses need not necessarily be in the same sphere. They need only be effective.

I am reasoning in the way I reasoned when I spoke with the President. If this situation arises, then, I repeat, the possibility of any kind of agreement on restraining military rivalry and the arms race will become highly problematical. I wish to go back to what I have already said: The present time is characterized by the fact that we have reached a certain point. And if we do not think and consider in a truly responsible way, then as a result of incorrect, erroneous conclusions on the part of politicians, steps could be taken which will result in grave consequences for all the peoples.

Of course, differences will remain between our countries. Rivalry will also persist. But it is necessary to ensure that it does not go beyond the bounds of the permissible, does not lead to military confrontation. Let each of the social systems demonstrate its advantages by means of setting an example.

We are well aware not only of the weak points, but of the strong points of U.S. society and of the other developed countries. We know their achievements and their potential. Naturally, we know our own potential better, including our unrealized potential. In a word, we are in favor of competition with the United States active competition. History itself, and not merely theoretical considerations and reasonings, has confirmed the viability of the policy of peaceful coexistence.

In the development of mutual relations between the USSR and the United States, much depends on how each side perceives the world around it. Here, it seems to us, it is particularly important to have a clear understanding of historical realities and to take them into account in shaping policy. In this case I have in mind both the Soviet and the U.S. leadership.

The world today is a highly multifaceted conglomeration of sovereign countries and peoples with their own interests, their own desires, their own policy,



traditions and dreams. Many of them have only just embarked on the path of independent development. Their first steps are taking place in incredibly difficult conditions left over from colonialism, from foreign dependence. Some of them, having achieved political independence, want to secure economic independence. They see that they have resources and manpower; that is, they have what they need to secure a better life in an appropriate labor process. These are vast continents. The desire of every people to realize its sovereign right in the political sphere, the economic sphere and the social sphere is natural.

Although people many like or dislike this policy, it reflects internal processes in each particular country, the interests of a particular people, who have a sovereign right. The right to choose--to choose their path, system, methods, ways to choose their friends--that is the right of every people. If we do not acknowledge that, I do not know how we can build international relations.

When I visited Britain last December, I recalled an expression of Palmerston's. I came across it when I was studying international relations in law school at Moscow University. Palmerston said that Britain does not have eternal friends or eternal enemies, it only has eternal interests. I told Margaret Thatcher then that I agree with that. But if Palmerston and you, Britain's present political leader, admit that you have such interests, you must admit that other peoples and other countries have their interests, too.

When there are about 200 states operating in the international arena, each of them strives to obtain its own interests. But to what extent are they realized? This depends on the consideration given to other states' interest on the basis of cooperation. But regarding the entire world as somebody's domain is an approach which we reject. We have always said this--we said it 10 years ago, we say it today and we will say it tomorrow: We do not have a double policy. We pursue an honest and open policy. This is how we shall operate in the future.

Tension, regional conflicts and even wars between different states in various corners of the world are rooted both in the past and in the present day socioeconomic conditions of these countries and regions. To portray matters as if all these knots of contradictions are the result of rivalry between East and West is not only incorrect but extremely dangerous. I told the President and the U.S. delegation this.

If, for example, Mexico, Brazil and a number of other states are today unable to pay not only their debts but also the interest on them you can picture what processes are going on in these countries. This could exacerbate the situation and lead to an explosion. Will there then again be talk about the "hand of Moscow"? Such arguments on such questions cannot be presented to the world so irresponsibly! These banalities are still current in some places; but they are impermissible, particularly at meetings such as ours. We therefore said immediately: Let us not speak banalities to each other. Many of them were voiced beforehand, in the course of the preparation for the meeting. There was quite a skirmish, and not without assistance from you journalists (animation in the hall).

Of course, the Soviet Union and the United States are two mighty powers with global interests and their own allies and friends. They have their own foreign policy priorities. But the Soviet leadership sees this not as a source of confrontation but rather a source of increased, special responsibility for the Soviet Union and the United States and their leaders for the fate of peace. This is our concept of the matter. Of course, we may argue about the situation in a given region of the world. Our assessments will be different and often opposite, particularly when it is a matter of given events or the causes of given conflicts. In principle we are not opposed to discussing given regional problems in the context of seeking ways to promote their settlement. We spoke about this and agreed with the President to continue joint efforts, which is reflected in the final joint document. But here we constantly stress--and I particularly want to say this now--without interference in other states' internal affairs. This is our conception of Soviet-U.S. relations which we brought to Geneva and which we spelled out to the President and the entire U.S. delegation. It was presented in more detailed form, but I have attempted to expound its essence to you here.

We consider that the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations is entirely possible. Many problems--I would say heaps--which need to be cleared away have build up. The Soviet leadership has the political will to see that this work is done. But it must be done jointly with the U.S. side. It is well known that when geologists or miners experience a rockfall and find themselves in a critical situation rescue teams advance toward each other to rescue people.

To save our relations from the growth of tension, ensure that they do not move in the direction of confrontation, and return them to a normal channel, to normalization--this work must be done by joint efforts. We are ready for this. I told the U.S. President that it would be a great mistake if we failed to make use of the chance that has emerged for turning the situation in Soviet-U.S. relations in the direction of normalization and consequently in the direction of improving the situation in the world as a whole.

I wish to return once again to the main question, which was, as it were, the pivot of the meeting in Geneva. There was not a single session, not a single one-on-one meetings, at which questions of war and peace and arms control did not occupy the central place. This was the pivot of the Geneva meeting. We explained to the U.S. side that the "star wars" program will not only import impetus to the arms race in all kinds of arms but will also put an end to any containment of this race. In response we were repeatedly told about the allegedly defensive nature of the large-scale ABM system with space-based elements. We were asked: What would you tell your people after Geneva if you gave up the introduction of strategic arms reductions? Our reply to this was as follows--and I will repeat it: This is not the case. We are prepared for a radical reduction in nuclear weapons provided that the door to development of an arms race in space is firmly shut. Given this condition we are prepared to cross the first stage on the basis of the application of the 50-percent principle of nuclear arms reductions and then, involving the other nuclear powers, to advance further along the path of radical reductions.



In a certain part of the world, maybe even among some political figures, and in journalistic circles there is a kind of certain positive reaction to SDI, so to speak. It is allegedly a defensive weapon, some kind of shield. This is absolutely not so. Essentially--taking into account the fact that mountains of weapons have already accumulated in the world, an arms race is in progress, and we cannot cope with this process in any way, take it in hand, and curb and reverse it--what the United States is proposing to us in this most difficult situation is the initiation of a competition in space. Who can guarantee that in that case we would be at all able to organize productive talks of some kind? I believe that no sober-minded person could give such a guarantee. The U.S. side does not wish to acknowledge that SDI means putting weapons into space. These are indeed weapons. They--US and Soviet weapons--would be flying in waves above people's heads. We would all gaze at the sky and anticipate what would rain down from it. Let us imagine--and we said this to the U.S. side--the consequences of even an accidental collision in space. Let us say that something breaks off a missile--the tip shall we say, carries on while the delivery vehicle falls away and collides with a cluster of these space weapons. Signals would go out, which would be interpreted almost as an attempt by the other side--in this instance I am not talking about our side or any particular side--as a signal that an attempt is being made to destroy these weapons. All the computers are switched on, and in this situation politicians can do nothing sensible at all. What, are we doing to be the prisoner of these events? Many pictures of this kind could be painted. I told the U.S. President: We feel that this idea has captivated him as a man, and to some extent we can understand this. But his position as a politician responsible for such a powerful state and for security questions is incomprehensible to us in this matter. We believe that following our tasks the U.S. side will weigh most responsibly everything that we said on this subject.

We can see that it again became clear at the meeting that the Americans do not like our logic and that we can in no way discern logic in their arguments. They say: Believe us that if the United States realizes the SDI first, it will share it with the Soviet Union. I then said: Mr. President, I urge you, believe us--we have already said on this score that we will not be the first to use nuclear weapons and will not attack the United States. So why do you, while retaining an entire offensive potential on earth and underwater, still intend to unleash an arms race in space? Do you not believe us? It transpires that you do not believe us. So why should we believe you more than you believe us? Especially since we have grounds for not believing you for we are extending an invitation not to go into space and to engage in disarmament on earth. All this is comprehensible to everybody.

In general I would like to hope that this is not the American side's final word. The conversation with the President was detailed; we listened attentively to each other's arguments and took note of it all. If the United States finds the will and determination to again ponder and assess all the deleterious aspects and consequences of the "star wars" program the way will be opened for the constructive solution of problems of international security and the ending of the arms race. When I say this, I bear in mind that this also applies to verification problems. Numerous speculations are being built around this problem, with the USSR's position being deliberately distorted.

But the truth is that the Soviet Union is open to verification. If agreement is reached on banning the putting of weapons into space, we are prepared on a reciprocal basis to open our laboratories for monitoring of such an accord. But the kind of thing that is being proposed to us is: Let us open up the laboratories and monitor the progress of the arms race in space. This is naive, and moreover the point of departure is flawed and unacceptable.

If the U.S. side also ends any nuclear weapon tests and we conclude an agreement on this, again there will be no problems from our side with respect to verification, including international verification.

If the two sides agree to reduce nuclear weapons by 50 percent, it is of course necessary to verify the reduction process; and we have no less interest in this than the American do.

I wish to say in literally a couple of words that, at this stage, differences of position emerged with respect to a 50 percent reduction of nuclear weapons. We have criticisms of the draft submitted by the United States, and the United States has criticisms of our drafts, but we do not dramatize these differences and are prepared to seek a mutually acceptable solution--if, of course, an arms race is not started in space. The two sides' proposals are a basis for seeking mutually acceptable solutions. Compromises are possible here; time and clarification of the situation will be required. We are prepared to seek these solutions proceeding from the fundamental principle that we do not seek to achieve military superiority and are in favor of equal security.

An exchange on problems of a humanitarian nature took place at the meeting. This resulted in corresponding agreements reflected in the joint statement. I would remind you that there was success in reaching agreement on certain questions of bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations and that agreement was reached on expanding contacts in the scientific and cultural fields and in the sphere of education and information. There will be more extensive exchanges of students, television programs and sports delegations. Agreement in principle was reached on concluding an air traffic agreement. I believe that there is information from Moscow to the effect that this problem was also eliminated yesterday.

I want particularly to draw your attention to the fact that it was decided to jointly approach a number of other states concerning cooperation in the sphere of thermonuclear fusion. This is a very interesting idea. Its implementation could mark the start of a new chapter in an exceedingly important area: providing mankind with an essentially inexhaustible source of energy. This is a field for joint activity; and, incidentally, it needs enormous effort on the part of scientists, an enormous technological effort, and new technological solutions--all this will advance technological progress and technology.

From the viewpoint of the political results and consequences of the meeting, it is important, it seems to me, to consider yet another factor. We have seen the major political impact of the meeting. It has revealed and stimulated world public interest in the problems of Soviet-U.S. relations, the danger of the arms race, and the need to normalize the situation.

I must mention a few episodes in this connection. The day before yesterday our mission was visited by a group of leaders of U.S. pacifist movements, headed by the prominent politician Jesse Jackson. I want to say that we have seen and do see them as worthy and estimable U.S. citizens representing millions of inhabitants of the United States who signed an appeal to President Reagan and myself hoping that the meeting would be successful and containing specific proposals on strengthening peace, including a call for an end to nuclear tests. U.S. war veterans, participants in the meeting on the Elbe, have come to Geneva; representatives of many public organizations in other countries, including children's organizations, have also been here. At my request, the group was received by the Soviet delegation. It was a moving meeting. In addition to that is the fact that we have constantly been aware of the powerful support and solidarity of our socialist friends and the nonaligned countries. Prior to the meeting the leaders of six states--India, Mexico, Argentina, Tanzania, Greece and Sweden--proposed a freeze on all types of nuclear weapons. We value highly their initiative. A large group of Nobel Prize winners put forward proposals which I was prepared to endorse immediately, except for one. There was one request or demand: Do not leave Geneva until you have reached an agreement. It was risky to agree to that. It might have been a long time before I returned home (animation in the hall). I would react differently now. I would certainly endorse this point (laughter in the hall, applause).

Esteemed gentlemen, ladies and comrades, at decisive and critical stages in history moments of truth are absolutely vital. The international situation has become too dangerous because of the intensification of the arms race, and there have been too many fables on this score to intimidate people. There has arisen a real need to clear the air and verify words by action. The best way to do this is to have a direct discussion, the kind of discussion you would normally expect at a summit meeting, particularly when you consider our countries and their role and responsibility in the world. In this case the discussion of problems is transferred to a new plane, where it is no longer possible to hide from the truth. So when we talk about the general results of the meeting, there is scarcely going to be one correct and straightforward assessment. Of course, it would have been far better if in Geneva we had reached agreement on the main, key problem--ending the arms race. This did not happen, unfortunately.

The American side was not yet ready for major decisions. But I think that the process as a whole could not have been solved in those two days even if it had been on that wavelength. We have the mechanism. But, at the same time, the meeting was too important an event to be evaluated in oversimplified terms. It provided a clearer picture of the nature of our differences and made it possible to dismiss--at least that is what I believe and hope--certain biased opinions about the USSR and the policy of its leadership and remove some of the prejudices that have built up. This may have a beneficial effect on the future process of the development of events. Trust is not restored right away; it is a difficult process. We have heeded the U.S. President's assurances that the United States is not seeking superiority and does not want nuclear war. We sincerely want these statements to be confirmed by action.

I would like to see the meeting as the start of a dialogue aimed at achieving changes for the better in Soviet-U.S. relations and in the world in general. And in this sense I would assess the meeting as having created opportunities for progress.

This is our general assessment of the results and significance of the meeting. And it gives me grounds, as I leave hospitable Geneva, for viewing the future with optimism. Common sense must triumph. Until we meet again (applause).

M.S. Gorbachev then answered journalists' questions.

Question (BBC, Britain): Mr. General Secretary, what, in your view, are the prospects for the development of mutual relations between the USSR and the United States and the international situation as a whole after the Geneva meeting?

Answer: I am still optimistic about the future. If we all continue to act in the spirit of responsibility, both in Soviet-U.S. relations and in international relations as a whole, which was felt at the Geneva meeting, we will find answers to the most urgent problems and approaches to their solution. I am deeply convinced of this.

Question (Soviet television): You spoke of the need for a new approach in present-day international relations, new thinking even. What do you see as the substance of this new approach, this new thinking?

Answer: Yes, I am convinced that a new policy is needed at the present stage of international relations, characterized by a greater interrelationship between states, by their interdependence.

We think that the new approach requires that the present-day policy of any state should be a product of the realities of today's world. This is the chief prerequisite for a constructive foreign policy. And this will lead to an improvement of the situation in the world.

Problems of peace and war lie at the center of world politics. They are a special preoccupation of all peoples.

All countries, developed capitalist and socialist and developing, have economic, social and ecological problems. They can best be solved on the basis of cooperation and mutual understanding. Dialogue is needed, cooperation must be expanded; it requires a combined effort.

Take the problems of the developing world: you cannot escape from them. And the new policy, which accords with the realities, compels us all to seek answers to the problems of this multitude of states which are striving for a better life.

The paramount question--and I return to it--is that everything must be done to halt the arms race. Realization of this is growing. Unless this task is solved, all our hopes, plans and actions could be undermined.

I am convinced that there will be no progress with the old approach which hinges on purely egotistical interests--although it is presented as protection of national interests. A new policy is needed, one that accords with the present stage, taking into account the realities brought to the fore by the actual course of world development.

Question (U.S. NBC Television): During World War II the United States and the Soviet Union fought together against fascism and defeated it. In view of your conversations with President Reagan, do you consider that the Soviet Union and the United States can be allies again in the struggle against famine in Africa, against international terrorism, against environmental pollution, against such diseases as cancer and others?

Answer: I am grateful to you for recalling an important stage in our joint history. We remember it; we have not forgotten it. I think that as a result of the Geneva meeting there are possibilities for broad cooperation between our countries and peoples. And when I say between our countries and peoples, I am not oversimplifying the situation.

I know the depth of the differences that currently separate us, and I am aware of the real state of current Soviet-U.S. relations. But I am convinced that collaboration is possible, including cooperation on the problems you mention. I am not going to dwell on the nuances of these problems at the moment. We will be able to make enormous funds available to come to the aid of the developing countries.

Today a huge number of people, half of them children, are hungry or undernourished in Latin America alone. Some 5 to 10 percent reduction in world military expenditure would make it possible to eliminate this problem.

All of this deserves thinking about this problem.

I welcome your question and I answer in the affirmative; although this does not mean that there are not certain nuances of approach to the problems you mention.

Question (U.S. NBC Television): You said you were disappointed with President Reagan's answer on SDI. After the meeting there are still as many weapons as there were before the meeting. Can one say that the world is a safer place after Geneva? If so, why?

Answer: I will take the liberty of saying that although there are as many weapons as before the meeting, the world has become a safer place. At any rate, it appears to me that the meeting itself and its results are a definite contribution to the strengthening of security, since the meeting represents the start of the path to dialogue, to understanding--that is, to what helps to strengthen security. Geneva has had a political impact in this area.

Question (PRAVDA): What specific, practical steps could the Soviet Union and the United States take to ensure an immediate end to the arms race?

Answer: Although I devoted my entire speech to this, I want to say once again: We must stop.

If we prevent the arms race in space, both our proposals and what the U.S. side is proposing make it possible to move forward, to seek compromises and strive for parity at a lower level. There is a good mechanism for this--the Geneva talks.

I would add that we hope that the U.S. Administration has not yet said its final word on the banning of all nuclear weapon tests. The whole world wants this. The U.S. side still has time to ponder the situation. A positive decision would be an enormous step which would stimulate the process of halting and reducing the arms race.

I think that this process would be facilitated by the further deepening of dialogue between the USSR and the United States. We have agreed to expand it and I think that participation in political dialogue by our countries' top leaders will contribute to the process of discontinuation of the arms race.

And another thing: What is being discussed at the Geneva talks--that is, the objectives and subject of the talks--is a matter for all the peoples. Responsible politicians, above all state leaders, must adopt a firm and constructive stance on this question. This would be of enormous significance.

I think that the vast majority of politicians want to speed up the quest for solutions in Geneva and to find ways to halt the arms race and undertake disarmament.

Question (GDR television): What, in our opinion, are the most important results of the meeting? And another question: What is the significance of political dialogue at the highest level?

Answer: In answer to your question, I would like to stress first of all that the Geneva meeting is an important stage in Soviet-U.S. relations. It lays the foundations for the quest for ways of improving them and normalizing them in all salients. If this quest is continued in further joint efforts by both sides, this will help to improve the world situation. That, I would say, is the political result.

At the Geneva meeting attention was centered on questions of concern to the peoples of the world. The joint statement of the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States to the effect that nuclear war is impossible, that it must never be unleashed, that they do not seek military superiority, that they will give new impetus to the Geneva talks--this in itself is of tremendous significance, if it is consistently implemented in practical steps.

Now as to your second question. I think the meeting showed that under all circumstances, we should seek to maintain political dialogue, which makes it possible to compare our positions, understand each other better and on this basis seek mutually acceptable solutions to the vital problems of today.



Question (the Italian newspaper IL MATTINO): During World War II the Soviet Union suffered great material and human losses. All the same, do you not think that 40 years after the end of the war the Soviet Union could promote the unification of the two German states?

Answer: I think that question was discussed and examined in great depth at the Helsinki conference. The Helsinki process and the Final Act signed by all the states of Europe, as well as the United States and Canada, is our common achievement. The Helsinki process deserves our support, deserves to be developed in every way. So the results of Helsinki answer your question.

Question (Swiss radio): You stressed the profound difference in the positions of the USSR and the United States on "star wars." Does not this hamper progress at the Geneva talks?

Answer: I do not want to repeat what has been said. Our position can be expressed in a few words. We adhere to a constructive line at the Geneva talks. We will seek a solution in order to be able to stop the arms race and achieve a radical reduction in nuclear arms, so that at some subsequent stage we can really approach the elimination of nuclear weapons with the participation of all nuclear powers. It is our firm belief that this is possible, if the door is firmly closed on the development of an arms race in space.

Question (AP): You spoke of the President's personal commitment to the "star wars" program and said that you discussed the SDI in detail. How did he treat your arguments? How did he react to them? Do you see a possibility of breaking the deadlock on this issue?

Answer: I think that after the meeting the American side has grounds to consider everything that we said. We hope that our arguments will be understood. They embody a meaning which, as we see it, is in line with the spirit of the January accord; namely, that as a result of the Geneva talks, we must take the path of radical reductions in nuclear arms provided that an arms race in space is prevented.

This objective was jointly determined by us earlier. The U.S. President declares that SDI is a shield. I hope that we demonstrated convincingly that it is a space weapon which could be used against missiles, against satellites and against targets on earth. This is a new type of weapon. A new sphere of the arms race is thereby opened up. This is unacceptable. This would complicate the entire situation and would create a problematic atmosphere at the Geneva talks.

This is why I valued the fact that it has been emphasized at the level of the U.S. President and the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee that work at the Geneva talks will be accelerated on the basis of the January accord.

This is now a viewpoint which is backed not only by the signatures of foreign ministers but also by the leaders of the two states. We regard this as a certain signal of a hope.

Question (BBC, Britain): If it proves impossible to agree on ending the arms race in space, will the Soviet Union be able to compete with the U.S. technology in this sphere, or will it fall behind the United States?

Answer: You have touched on a very interesting question. During a frank and direct conversation, I tried to explain to the President that it seems to me that a great deal in U.S. policy regarding the Soviet Union is based on disillusion. On the one hand, they hope that the arms race and its continuation will exhaust the Soviet Union economically, will weaken its influence in the world and will thereby free the hands of the United States. History disgraced these prophets. And this was at a time when our society possessed a potential different from today's and lesser opportunities. Now we possess a tremendous potential. And delusions about us only hamper the pursuit of a realistic policy.

On the other hand there were also delusions with regard to military calculations. They tried to overtake us. They adopted intercontinental ballistic missiles as part of their armory. This was followed by the response. The response came a little later, but it came. Then multiple nuclear warheads appeared, followed by the response. We have always found a response.

I think that the illusions existing in U.S. military circles have now been passed on in some degree to political circles and in particular to the President, perhaps. I do not claim this, but that was the impression we formed.

The United States clearly believes that it has something of a lead on us in certain types of technology, in computer and radioelectronic technology. Once again a desire is emerging to seize this "advantage" and to secure military superiority for themselves. The well-known phrase of President Johnson's, who once said that the nation that dominates in space will also dominate on earth, is again in vogue. Some people are clearly itching to achieve world domination and to look down haughtily on the world. These are the old ambitions of former years. The world has changed a great deal in many respects.

So when it comes to the so-called technological superiority that it is planned to embody in the SDI, thus placing the Soviet Union in a difficult position, what I want to say is: This is another delusion. A response will be found.

I said as much to the President: "You must bear in mind that you are not dealing with simpletons."

If the President is so committed to the SDI, we naturally regard it as our duty to thoroughly investigate the "star wars" program.

And we have examined the problem, especially as the U.S. side is extending a kind of invitation: Let's see, let's take a look, let's discuss not the question of preventing the militarization of space but what weapons to take into space. We are against this. We are against an arms race in space.



We also analyzed the other aspect of the question: suppose the United States does not accept our arguments, does not appreciate our good will and our call to seek a way out along the road of ending the arms race and reducing the existing nuclear weapons; in other words, suppose it follows the old path. We will of course find a response. The Soviet leadership once gave appropriate instructions to the competent organizations and scientists, and we can say that our response will be effective, less expensive and able to be implemented in a shorter time.

But this is not our political choice. That choice is to induce the United States nonetheless to consider the whole situation and pursue a responsible policy on a basis of common sense, on a basis of consideration of people's sentiments and aspirations, and not to complicate this, the most acute problem in international relations.

Question (Czechoslovak television and the newspaper RUDE PRAVO): In what specific and practical spheres do you see possibilities of developing Soviet-U.S. relations after your meeting with President Reagan?

Answer: I think political dialogue will expand. And it will be conducted at various levels. We have agreed to exchange visits. In itself this must be welcomed. We will have additional opportunities to develop bilateral cooperation in the spheres on which we reached agreement. Clearly, we will continue to expand our consultations to examine regional problems and the situation in various regions.

Finally, we proceed from the premise that both we and American business circles retain a mutual interest--I know this for certain--in improving relations. If things go in this direction, it will make it possible to expand the scale of cooperation in the economic sphere. We are prepared to invite American business circles to participate in implementing major projects. We have great plans. With the West Europeans we are now doing much to expand the framework of our economic cooperation. We welcome this.

I expressed to the President the thought that the sphere of economic relations cannot be underestimated. Not because the United States cannot live without us or we cannot live without it. We will be perfectly able to live without the United States. And I hope United States will live without us. But this is the material base for political relations, for their improvement, and for the formation of an atmosphere of confidence.

Frankly speaking, interdependence emerges in the process of economic ties. And this interdependence is then reflected during the resolution of political problems.

I think that a further expansion of economic ties would accord with the interests of both the Soviet Union and the United States. But do not think that we are fishing for this.

Question (the Lebanese newspaper AL-NAHAR ARAB REPORT): Speaking of regional questions, did you discuss the situation in the Middle East and the situation

in Lebanon in particular? What is your forecast regarding the situation there after the summit meeting?

Answer: During the meeting we touched on the situation in regions such as Central America, the Middle East and Africa. However, practically the whole time was devoted to examining the fundamental aspect of these questions. We agreed to continue political consultations and to expand the framework of collaboration on regional problems.

Question (writer Yu. Semenov): Mikhail Sergeryevich, you have said that it is necessary to learn the art of living together. My experience as a writer shows that, beginning with the dismal McCarthy era, U.S. movies and television have unfortunately portrayed Soviet man as some kind of monster to the American people. Don't you think that now, after the Geneva meeting, it would be very important for the United States to revise such prejudiced notions and view the Soviet people more objectively as a partner of the American people.

Answer: Here is what I have to say to you, Comrade Semenov. Do not leave everything to political leaders (animation in the hall). We have agreed on an expansion of cultural contacts--including the movies--so you get together and reach agreement with each other. It is necessary to act in the spirit of Geneva; that is, to promote an improvement in Soviet-American relations.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

CSO: 1802/5-F

FOURTH SESSION OF THE USSR SUPREME SOVIET ELEVENTH CONVOCATION

ADDRESS BY DEPUTY M.S. GORBACHEV

LD260714 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17 Nov 85 (signed to press 28 Nov 85)  
pp 31-32

[Text] Comrade deputies:

On the instructions of the CPSU Central Committee and the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, I submit for your consideration the proposal for Comrade Ryzhkov to be appointed chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, ratifying the ukase of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted on this issue on 27 September 1985.

Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov has proved himself to be a man of great organizational abilities, endowed with rich experience in production, management and party work. Whatever spheres he has been entrusted with by the party--as general director of Uralmash, first USSR deputy minister of heavy and transport machine building, first deputy chairman of USSR Gosplan, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee--in all these posts, Ryzhkov has worked exerting all of his strength and knowledge, working selflessly and creatively.

Now that he has been entrusted with the post of chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Nikolay Ivanovich has set to work energetically and has submitted for the Politburo's and government's consideration a series of substantial proposals aimed at improving the management of the national economy. The right direction, then, has been taken. It is now important to proceed persistently ahead along the course designated by the April 1985 plenum and subsequent plenums of the CPSU Central Committee, and reflected in such major documents as the draft of the new edition of the party program and the basic guidelines for the country's economic and social development for the 5-year period and in the longer term.

The interests and will of our people and its aspirations for the economic and defense might of the motherland to be even stronger and for the Soviet man to live and work even better, are concentrated in and focused around the policy of the Communist Party.

Taking this as the point of departure, what do we expect of the government of the Soviet Union?

The first thing is even more energetic implementation of the course that has been mapped out by the party for an acceleration of the country's social and economic development, for the development of scientific and technical progress, and the main lever for the intensification of the national economy and raising its effectiveness. This is the basic road towards ensuring a further enhancement of well-being, which is the highest goal of our party and state.

The second thing on which the government must work persistently is the further improvement of planning, ensuring the balanced and integrated development of the national economy and the strengthening of our financial system. This means that the Council of Ministers, holding within its vision all sectors of the economic mechanism, must devote its primary attention to the more important problems, those which are common for the whole economy and track the way in which interaction is ensured at the points where the different industries come together--which is where, as we know, the greatest reserves for our continued growth are frequently to be found.

The third thing upon which the attention of the government must be concentrated is the further improvement of the system of state administration, which is placed in one of the main positions amongst its tasks by the Law on the USSR Council of Ministers. Particularly important here are both the strengthening of centralized planned, the introduction of economic methods of leadership and the extensive development of the initiative and upgrading the autonomy and responsibility of associations, enterprises and local bodies and the strengthening of the level of the demand made upon ministers and department managers for the state of work in the relevant sectors and for satisfying the requirements of society.

Finally, guaranteeing the security and defense capability of the country, active foreign policy activity in the interests of peace on earth, the development and deepening of socialist economic integration, fraternal friendship and all-round cooperation with the socialist countries have been and remain a prime concern of the government.

In a word, comrade deputies, we expect from the government active steps to implement the country's planned economic and social development and to implement consistently the party's domestic and foreign policy.

The content and the rhythm of the activity of all management bodies, from republic governments to the executive committees of the local soviets, depends upon the tone that is set by the USSR Council of Ministers in its work. The style of the work of the union government, therefore, must serve an example of deep analysis, of precision and exigency, of consistency in implementing decisions that have been made and of constant concern for the interests of the people and the satisfaction of the wants of the working people. It is precisely in this that Vladimir Ilich Lenin, the first chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, saw the main meaning of the activity of the government.

I think that we have complete grounds for expressing confidence that the Council of Ministers and its chairman, will do everything to raise even higher the level of its work, so that this work might accord in full measure with the demands that are being put forward by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (applause).

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

CSO: 1802/5-F

SPEECH BY CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE GENERAL SECRETARY, DEPUTY M.S. GORBACHEV

LD271038 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17 Nov 85 (signed to press 28 Nov 85)  
pp 32-49

[Text] Comrade deputies: Most important questions of the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet state are submitted for discussion at the current session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The laws on the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR and the State Budget for 1986, adopted by this session, are of huge significance for our country, its present and its future, and for each labor collective and each Soviet family. The coming year, 1986, marks not only the first year of the 12th 5-Year Plan, but opens a qualitatively new stage in the development of Soviet society.

The plan for 1986 reflects the party's strategic line of acceleration of social and economic development of the country. It envisages higher growth rates in national income, industrial and agricultural output, and labor productivity. There will be a growth of effectiveness of material resources being utilized. Priority development of industries which are to ensure scientific and technical progress and raise the quality of production have been defined.

Measures have been mapped out for accelerating the reconstruction, renewal and modernization of production, and the perfection of management and the economic mechanisms. A further raising of the people's well-being is envisaged.

It is important, comrades, for all of us constantly to bear in mind the special features of the 1986 plan.

Already in the first year of the 5-year plan, an even pace must be set for the whole 5-year plan period. On the basis of this, the rates for the national economy's development for 1986 have been envisaged such that their fulfillment, together with a gradual build-up of intensity in the following years, will ensure a way to fulfillment of the tasks of the 5-year plan period as a whole. This will make it possible to avoid the situation which occurred in the last 5-year plan period, when reduced indices were set for the initial years while the main growth was left for the final years. It is well known to what negative results such a practice led.



The second special feature of the draft plan is the fact that in its compilation, maximum account was taken of the need to accelerate scientific and technical progress. On the basis of the directive of the July conference in the CPSU Central Committee, first and foremost tasks for accelerating scientific and technical progress have been included in the plan. They have been envisaged by decrees on the development of major directions of science and technology in the sectors of the national economy. At the same time, the foundations upon which planning came to be based, have been revised to a great extent. For the first time, the most important and general indicators of the scientific and technical progress of sectors and of its efficiency have been envisaged in the plan. These indices are determined with the aim of intensifying the practical work of ministries, associations and enterprises to secure the attainment of top targets in the development of science and technology.

The next special feature of the 1986 plan is its orientation toward implementing a practical transfer to intensive management methods. This is dictated by life itself, by the complicated situation which is developing with labor and material resources and by the exhaustion of primarily extensive factors in the economy's growth. Next year, we must ensure that the growth in the volume of production is to a maximum extent secured through conservation of resources. In other words, economy is indeed becoming the main source of resource for the whole of the increase in production volume. This is shown by the following figures: Next year 97 percent of the increase in the national income will be obtained through higher labor productivity. The metal consumption in the national income will be reduced by 2.7 percent and power output ratio by 3 percent.

Finally, this is a broad conversion to new methods of management which have positively recommended themselves. From January 1986 on, over one half of all industrial output will be produced at enterprises working under new conditions.

In general, comrades, the line that has been taken is a correct one. Now we have to implement it, both in the process of further studying the plan in sectors, republics, krais, oblasts, associations and enterprises and, of course, in concrete, practical work. This aspect must be stressed also because many workers at the center in the localities, including the economic planning bodies, have not completely understood the importance of evaluating and solving the economic, social and financial problems of the country in a new way.

The present session is taking place in a very responsible period. Prior to the congress, the April Central Committee Plenum worked out a policy line directed toward speeding up the society's socioeconomic development; made a start on substantial changes in the approaches to resolving economic and political tasks; and gave new pace to all the activities of party, state and soviet organizations, as well as of all our cadres and labor collectives.

The political course of the party, both on issues of domestic life and on international problems, was given its fullest reflection in the most important theoretical and political documents which will be put before the 27th CPSU

Congress; in the drafts of the new edition of the CPSU Program and the changes in the party statutes, and in the Basic Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1986 -90 and in the Period up to the Year 2000.

The initial results of the great consultation underway between the party and the people show that the documents put forward for discussion arouse great satisfaction among Soviet people. Active support for the party's strategic course, support in word and deed, serve as the source of our optimism, our confidence in the correctness of the course chosen and that the targets will be met without fail (sustained applause).

As you know, comrade deputies, recently the party's Central Committee and the Soviet government adopted a series of major measures directed at accelerating the transition of the economy to intensive development, upgrading the efficiency of national economic management. Practical steps are being taken to ensure further order, to strengthen labor and state discipline, to follow a policy of very strict economy and to fight against drunkenness and alcoholism. In other words, in all spheres of public life, great intensive work has been unleashed, which is already beginning to bear fruits.

The new features which today are entering our public life have roused the Soviet people, activated their creative strengths and shown, time and time again, what enormous reserves and possibilities lie in the socialist system.

We may now firmly say: things have started to change for the better. The rates of production growth are increasing and other economic indices are improving. Despite interruptions in a number of sectors of the national economy at the beginning of the year, Soviet people have managed to rectify the situation and secure the attainment of the economy's planned targets. Positive changes also are taking place in the country's agrarian sector.

For the things which have been achieved, the enormous contribution by our heroic working class, which, not sparing strength and energy, and overcoming difficulties, has done everything possible to fulfill the designated plans, deserves enormous credit. The positive results include the intensive labor by the kolkhoz peasantry, by all workers of the agroindustrial complex. Our achievements include the creative thought of scientists, engineers and the people's intelligentsia. Soviet youth, which boldly and energetically tackles the resolution of difficult and complex tasks and actively supports the changes taking place in society linking its future with them, has been a pioneer and initiator of many important beginnings.

We also link these changes with the stepping up of the activity of party, soviet and trade union bodies and all our cadres.

In a word, comrade deputies, a great deal is being done. It would, however, be a mistake to overestimate all this; but this is not in our traditions anyway. We are at the beginning of the projected path, a path which is difficult and intense, demanding the combination of a creative approach to the tasks that life puts forward, with purposefulness, high discipline, and self-sacrifice. We have enormous reserves and possibilities, and we have to work solidly to put them into action and use them to the fullest. This has to be

done on all fronts of economic, social and cultural construction, above all where the situation remains difficult and delays are being overcome slowly.

Now, in the final stage of the 5-year plan, it is necessary to work well in order to start, beginning next year, a confident and dynamic advancement, to assure the achievement of outlined goals, and to create prerequisites for further qualitative transformation of productive forces of the country.

Comrades, the 1986 plan illustrates graphically the peaceful creative character of our concerns. Our foreign political aspirations and the international policy of Soviet state are closely linked with such a peaceful trend of domestic policy.

The foreign policy directives of the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum were a concrete expression of Leninist foreign policy at the present stage. The plenum underlined the necessity to energize in every way the peace-loving policy of the USSR on the broadest possible front of international relations. It called for everything possible to be done for the forces of militarism and aggression not to prevail. It underlined the urgency of halting the arms race and stepping up the process of disarmament. It advocated the development of equal, correct and civilized relations among states, and the broadening and deepening of mutually advantageous economic relations.

These directives of the plenum were dictated by the time, specific features of the situation that had taken shape and the requirements of the socialist policy of peace and progress. In its assessment, the Central Committee Politburo proceeded from the fact that as a result of the continuing arms race the degree of unpredictability of events increases. The possibility of the militarization of space marks an entirely new jump in the arms race, which would inevitably lead to the disappearance of the very concept of strategic stability, the basis of the preservation of peace in the nuclear age. A situation would be created when fundamentally important decisions, irreversible in their possible consequences, in essence would be taken by computers without the participation of human reason and political will, not taking into account criteria of morals and morality. Such a development could lead to universal disaster even if triggered by a mistake, miscalculation or technical failure of extremely complex computer systems.

In other words, the development of the world events has reached a point where particularly responsible decisions are needed, when inaction or delay in action are criminal because the issue today is that of preserving civilization and life itself. This is why we considered and still consider it necessary to adopt all measures to break the vicious circle of the arms race and not to lose a single chance to turn the course of events around toward an improvement. The issue today is posed in a supremely sharp and defined way. We must rise above narrow interests and recognize the collective responsibility of those states before the danger which lies in wait for the community of mankind on the threshold of the third millennium.

It was precisely this approach that the April Plenum of the Central Committee empowered us to adopt in implementing foreign policy. This approach fully meets the interests of the Soviet people and the peoples of the socialist

states, and as we became convinced, meets with understanding in other countries in the world. Over a period of time, short but crammed with international events, the Soviet Union has been striving to act in concert with the very widest circles of states in the interests of peace. Our basis was and is that to emerge from the phase of dangerous tension is only possible through the efforts of all countries, big and small.

Over the past months, political and economic links among the countries of the socialist community have become significantly more active and deep. Long-term programs of cooperation in the fields of economics and scientific and technical progress have been worked out; a mechanism of energetic, concrete links has been set up, and coordination of foreign policy activity is becoming closer. The meetings of leaders of fraternal countries in Moscow, Warsaw, Sofia and Prague have become important landmarks on the road toward further consolidating the socialist community. Links with all socialist countries are developing and strengthening.

Cooperation with states which have freed themselves from the yoke of colonial oppression and who are members of the nonaligned movement is taking on a wider character. Significant steps have been made in developing relations with many of these countries. This is a factor of enormous significance in the troubled sea of contemporary international relations, a factor acting in favor of peace, equal rights, freedom and independence of peoples.

The Soviet Union also is putting effort into improving links with capitalist states. I would single out especially the recent Soviet-French meeting in Paris, during which substantial steps were taken to develop further bilateral cooperation, to strengthen European and international security, and toward a return to detente.

We will continue to build our foreign policy on a multiplane basis, on a basis of firm and stable bilateral relations with all countries. However, the reality of the present-day world is such that it contains states which, by virtue of their military, economic and scientific potential, and international weight, bear particular responsibility for the nature of world development, its progress and consequences. First and foremost such responsibility-- I stress, not a privilege but a responsibility--is borne by the Soviet Union and the United States.

If one approaches matters from these positions, the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, which took place last week was, in the estimation of the Central Committee Politburo, an important event not just in our bilateral relations, but also in world politics as a whole. I have already had occasion to speak of my first impressions of the talks with the U.S. President at the press conference in Geneva. The final document of the meeting, the joint statement, is also well known.

Today, addressing this session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, I would like to appraise the results and the significance of the Geneva meeting in the context of the present-day situation, taking into account the experience of the past, the prospects for the future and the problems we have to solve.

First of all, I must say that the path to the Geneva dialogue was long and not easy for many reasons. The U.S. administration that came to power at the beginning of the eighties openly took a course toward confrontation, rejecting the very possibility of development of Soviet-American relations. I think that everyone recalls the intensity of the anti-Soviet rhetoric of those years, the nature of action "by force" of American ruling circles.

The joint efforts of many years to create the necessary minimum of confidence in these relations were consigned to oblivion. Almost all the threads of bilateral cooperation were sundered. Detente itself was declared as being counter to U.S. interests.

Having taken up a course toward military superiority over the USSR, the administration undertook the implementation of programs for re-equipping the United States with nuclear and other arms. The deployment of U.S. first-strike missiles began in Western Europe. A situation was created fraught with a high level of military-political uncertainty and its attendant risks.

Finally, in addition, the "star wars" program, the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative," appeared. Washington "seized" on this idea, not giving much thought to the grave consequences which are inevitable in the event of its realization. The idea of taking weapons into space is extremely dangerous for all the peoples of the world, without exception. But we also know something else: This policy of the United States had inevitably to clash with reality. That is precisely what happened. The Soviet Union, together with its allies, stated clearly: Military superiority over us will not be permitted.

Even among the allies of the United States there arose confusion in the face of this evident disregard for the interests of their security and Washington's readiness to put everything at stake in pursuit of the chimera of military superiority. This course aroused serious doubts even in the United States itself. The proclamation of the plan for the preparation of "star wars" resounded like an alarm throughout the planet.

Those who thought that their line toward a confrontation would become the determinant one for international development were mistaken. I will add, perhaps, in this connection, that dreams of world domination are an impossibility, both as far as purpose and means are concerned. Just as the idea of perpetual motion comes from a lack of knowledge of the elementary laws of nature, imperial claims grow from a picture of the present-day world that is far removed from reality.

The Soviet Union has coupled its firm rebuff to the U.S. line toward disturbing the military-strategic balance with the promotion of large-scale peace initiatives and a display of restraint and constructive attitude in the approach to the central issues of peace and security.

By our initiatives, and these amount to quite a few, we have clearly demonstrated what we are striving for in the world--aims which we call the United States and its allies to strive for. These actions of the USSR have



met with the warm approval of the world public and have been highly appraised by the governments of many countries.

Influenced by these factors, Washington has been forced to maneuver. A show of love of peace has appeared in the statements of the U.S. administration. It has not been backed up by facts, but the very fact that it has been made is symptomatic.

At the beginning of the year, at our initiative, an accord was reached on new talks between the USSR and the United States, talks which were to interlink the whole complex of space and nuclear armaments, and to make their goal the prevention of an arms race in outer space and to end it on earth.

The atmosphere of Soviet-U.S. relations and the international behavior of the United States began to undergo change to some extent, and thus of course could not be ignored when examining the question of the possibility of a summit meeting.

In making such a decision our firm premise was that at the talks, central place must be given to those questions which determine our relations and also the whole world situation, questions of security. At the same time we took into account the political and strategic realities in Europe and the world, the opinion of our friends and allies, the positions of governments and public circles of many countries, and insistent appeals to the Soviet Union to do everything possible so that the summit might take place. We realized how much hope was being pinned on this meeting throughout the world, and we took specific steps to improve the international climate and to make it more favorable for the meeting.

At the talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva we put forward specific, radical proposals. What is the gist of these proposals? We proposed primarily to ban completely space strike armaments. We proposed this because starting an arms race in space, and even the deployment in near-earth space antimissile system alone, would not strengthen anyone's security. Covered by a space "shield," nuclear attack weapons would become still more dangerous.

The appearance of space strike weapons could turn the present strategic balance into strategic chaos, provoke a feverish arms race in all directions and undermine one of the most important foundations of its limitation, the ABM Treaty. As a result, mistrust among countries would grow, but security would be considerably reduced.

Further, together with a complete ban on space strike weapons, we proposed a one-half reduction of all existing USSR and U.S. nuclear weapons capable of reaching one another's territory, and to limit each side's overall number of nuclear warheads on them to a ceiling of 6,000 units. That is a radical reduction, measurable in thousands of nuclear warheads.

Such an approach is just: It embraces all the weapons which make up the strategic correlation of forces. It makes it possible to take into account the volume of the nuclear threat really extant for each side, independent of



how and from where the nuclear warheads are delivered to their territory--by missile or by aircraft, from one's own territory or from allies' territory.

We regard the 50 percent reduction of the nuclear weapons of the USSR and the United States as a start. We are ready to go further, as far as complete destruction of nuclear weapons with the participation, of course, of other nuclear states also.

Understandably, particular unease is provoked among the European peoples by the nuclear arms race. We well understand the unease. Europe is saturated with nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union advocates complete liberation of Europe from nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical. But the United States and its NATO partners do not agree to this. Then we proposed starting merely with interim solutions, later to be extended to further reductions. We are convinced that our proposals--to weaken the nuclear threat and increase Europe's security--are in keeping with the hopes of the European peoples.

I want to stress the fundamental aspect of the matter: In three areas of the talks--on space, strategic offensive weapons and medium range nuclear weapons--we are not making any proposals to the United States that would reduce its security. Moreover, our proposals provide the opportunity for the resolution of such matters which the U.S. side also places among its "particular concerns."

For example, much is being said about Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles. Our proposals envisage that the number of these missiles will be reduced; the proportion of their warheads within the overall level of nuclear charges will be limited. Or, to give another example: There is much noise made in the West over the Soviet SS-20 missiles. We are proposing to reduce these considerably in the context of resolving the problem of nuclear weapons in Europe.

The nuclear weapons of Britain and France are the stumbling block. They say that these cannot be discussed at Soviet-U.S. talks. We are ready to seek a solution to this as well; we propose to start a direct exchange of views with these countries regarding their nuclear weapons.

The Soviet proposals have been met with a broad and positive response worldwide. Behind them is the prestige of the Warsaw Pact states, who unanimously support our constructive stance. To a considerable extent, also in accord with our approach is the joint statement by the leaders of six countries--Argentina, Mexico, Tanzania, India, Sweden and Greece. The Soviet initiative was received with approval and hope by the communist and worker parties, major public organizations of various countries and continents, world famous scientists and eminent political and military figures. It received a positive reaction from the majority of parties in the Socialist International.

Not to mention the thousands of letters from Soviet and foreign citizens which arrived for me on the eve of and during the meeting in Geneva. I would like to take this opportunity to express gratitude to their authors for the good wishes, for the advice and support, for their profound and sincere concern for the preservation of peace (applause).

On the eve of the meeting, the Americans put forward their counterproposals. This is, in itself, a positive fact. One of our numerous initiatives evoked a favorable response.

Much has been written in the press on the essence of these counterproposals. I shall not repeat their content. I shall only say that they are proposals which only go half-way, and in many ways are unfair. They are based on a one-sided approach, obviously dictated by a desire for military superiority for the United States and NATO as a whole.

But the main point is that the U.S. position does not allow for a ban on the making of offensive space weapons. On the contrary, it wants to legalize their creation. The position adopted by the American side on the matter of "star wars" is the main obstacle on the path toward an agreement on arms control. This is not our opinion alone. The governments of France, Denmark, Norway, Greece, the Netherlands, Canada and Australia also refused to take part in the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative." On the eve of the Geneva meeting, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution calling upon the leaders of the USSR and the United States to work out effective agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in space and ending it on earth. It was only the United States and some of its allies which considered it possible not to support this clear appeal from the world community. This is a fact, as they say, which needs no comment.

One should, perhaps, also recall that there were powerful political forces at work in the United States, who were doing everything they could to at least emasculate the content of the meeting, to bring to nought its significance, if not to wreck it. I think many people have fresh recollection of actions such as the testing of an antisatellite system, the appearance of the battleship "Iowa", carrying long-range cruise missiles, in the Baltic, the accelerated deployment of Pershings in the FRG, the decision to create binary chemical weapons, and, finally, the adoption of yet another record military budget, and so on.

The President was already on his way to Geneva when the letter from the U.S. defense secretary became known, which entreated him not to agree to any accord with the USSR that would confirm the treaties on the limitation of strategic arms and antimissile defense, in other words, leaving the United States full freedom of action in all directions of the arms race, both on earth and in space.

But was the matter really limited to the Pentagon alone? A sort of "order" given to the U.S. President by U.S. extreme right-wing circles represented by the ideological headquarters of the Heritage Foundation, did not escape our attention. The President was instructed to continue the arms race, not to give the Soviet Union the opportunity to switch funds to the implementation of socioeconomic programs and to strive, in the final analysis, to squeeze the USSR out of international politics. These gentlemen went so far as to set the U.S. administration the task of forcing us to change our system and our constitution! These are familiar themes, comrades. We have had to listen to all this many times already. In a word, there were a good many attacks.

All the same, we made a decision in favor of the meeting with the U.S. President. We made it because we did not have the right to neglect even the slightest chance of restraining the dangerous development of events in the world. We made the decision, realizing that if we do not manage to start a direct and frank conversation now, tomorrow it will be a hundred times more difficult, and maybe altogether too late.

There is no argument, the differences between us are enormous. However, in the world today the interlinkage and interdependence between us are as great. The acuteness of the time we are living through does not leave the leaders of the USSR and the United States, the peoples of the USSR and the United States, any alternative but to comprehend the great science of living together.

From our very first tete-a-tete with the President--and such conversations occupied a great deal of the meeting in Geneva--the question was directly stated that the Soviet delegation had come to seek the solution of the most burning problem which is at the center of international life, the problem of preventing nuclear war and curbing the arms race. As I said to the President, therein lies the basic point of our meeting and this will also determine its results.

I must stress that the talks in Geneva were at times very pointed, I would say frank to the extreme. Here it was impossible to outwit each other or to escape with political and propaganda cliches. Too much depends on these pivotal questions of war and peace.

During the talks the U.S. side stubbornly insisted on the implementation of its SDI program. We were told that the issue is one of the creation of purely defensive means, which are allegedly in no way a weapon. It was also said that these means will help to stabilize the situation and get rid of nuclear weapons altogether. It was even proposed that these means be "shared" sometime in the foreseeable future, to open laboratory doors to one another.

We frankly told the President that we do not agree with such assessments. We carefully analyzed all these questions and arrived at the unequivocal conclusion that space weapons are not at all defensive; that they are capable of giving rise to the dangerous illusion that a nuclear first-strike can be made from behind a space shield, and a counterstrike be prevented, or at least attenuated. What guarantee is there that space weapons themselves would not be used as a means to knock out targets on earth? There is every indication that the U.S. antimissile space system is being planned not as a shield at all, but as part of a single offensive system.

Naturally, we cannot agree with the assertion that the space systems envisaged in his program are not weapons at all, just as we cannot rely on the assurance that the United States will share with us what it succeeds in setting up in this sphere.

If the laboratories are to be opened, then it would be only for purposes of verification of compliance with the ban on the creation of offensive space weapons, and certainly not to legitimate them.

We are told of the desire to remove the fear of missiles, to secure the elimination of nuclear weapons in general. Such a wish can only be welcomed. It fully corresponds with the aims of our policy. It is, however, a lot simpler to eliminate these weapons without creating offensive space systems for this purpose. Why spend tens or hundreds of billions of dollars and pile up more mountains of space weapons along with the nuclear weapons? What is the sense of that?

I asked the President, does the U.S. leadership really seriously suppose that while U.S. space weapons are being set up, we will reduce our strategic potential, and help the United States to weaken it with our own hands? It is useless to count on that. It is precisely the reverse that will happen. To restore balance, the Soviet Union will be forced to raise the efficiency, precision and might of its weapons in order to neutralize, if this is required, the electronic space machine of "star wars" being created by the Americans.

Will the Americans feel more comfortable if the echelons of space weapons planned by the U.S. are complemented in space by our weapons? People in the United States surely cannot hope that they will retain a monopoly in space. To say the least, this is not serious.

However, the U.S. administration is still not abandoning the temptation to try out the possibility of gaining military supremacy. Right now, by venturing into an arms race in space, they intend to outpace us in electronics and computers. But, as has been the case many times in the past, we will find a response. It will be an effective response, sufficiently quick and quite likely cheaper than the U.S. program. We also said this to the President most clearly (sustained applause).

I think that new approaches are needed, a fresh look at many things and, above all, political will from the leadership of both countries, for a real upturn in our relations, which would serve the interests of the USSR and United States and the interests of the peoples of the world. The USSR, and I stressed this in Geneva, does not feel enmity for the United States. It respects the American people. We do not base our policy upon a desire to encroach upon the national interests of the United States. I would go further: We, for example, would not want to change the strategic balance in our favor. We would not want this because this kind of situation will increase the suspicion of the other side and the instability of the overall situation.

Life is such that our countries will have to become accustomed to strategic parity as a natural state of affairs. We will have to reach a common understanding of what level of weapons each side could be considered relatively sufficient, from the point of view of its reliable defense. We are convinced that the level of this sufficiency is much lower than that which the USSR and United States in fact possess at the moment. And this means that weighty practical steps for the limitation and reduction of weapons are perfectly possible, measures which not only would not lessen, but would strengthen security both for the USSR and the United States and the entire strategic stability of the world.

What should I say about other matters discussed at the meeting?

I will begin with the problem of regional conflicts. Both sides expressed concern over the preservation of such "hot spots." This is understandable. Such conflicts are a dangerous thing, particularly given the threat of their spreading in the nuclear age.

However, our attitudes to the causes and to ways of eliminating such conflicts are, one could say, not just different, but directly opposite. The United States, having become accustomed to thinking in terms of "spheres of interest," reduced these problems down to rivalry between East and West. But in our times this is an anachronism, a recurrence of imperial thinking which denies the right of the majority of peoples to think and decide independently.

The deep sources of such conflicts are many-sided. Often their roots lie in history, but mainly they lie in those social and economic conditions under which liberated countries are placed. It is not accidental, of course, when talking about the problem of regional conflict that the United States keeps quiet about the brutalities of apartheid in the Republic of South Africa, and the aggression of that country toward its African neighbors; the war of U.S. puppets in Central America and Southeast Asia; the plundering by Israel in the Middle East, and many others. Washington attempts to put the legitimate governments of states who are advancing on the path of national liberation and social progress on the same level as counterrevolution.

It is self-evident that we could not accept such an interpretation. We have told the President that we are for the recognition of the inalienable right of each people to freedom and the independent choice of its own path; for this right not to be trampled on by anyone; for there to be no attempts of interference from the outside; for freedom and not tyranny to win. We have been and will remain on the side of peoples who are defending their independence. This is our principled course (applause).

The president touched upon the question of Afghanistan. In this connection it was confirmed once more that the Soviet Union advocates consistently a political settlement of the situation related to Afghanistan. We are in favor of Afghanistan, our friend and neighbor, being an independent and nonaligned state. We are in favor of establishing a state of affairs which guarantees noninterference in Afghanistan's affairs and by this means, the question about the withdrawal of Soviet troops from this country will be solved. The Soviet Union and the government of Afghanistan are entirely in favor of this and if there is anyone who hinders the speedy solution of the question, it is, above all, the United States, which finances, supports and arms the counterrevolutionary gangs, wrecks efforts for the normalization of the situation here.

Questions of bilateral relations had an important place at the talks. A certain amount of revival which has recently taken shape here has now been supported by specific agreements on exchanges and contacts in science, education and culture, and on the restoration of air communications between our countries.

But, of course, it is much easier to develop in the full extent the potential founded here when the solution of questions of security, which define our mutual relations, is undertaken. And if there is to be cooperation, then it must be equal cooperation, without any discrimination and without any preliminary conditions, without attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of the other side. On this matter our position is firm and consistent.

How then is one to assess the main results of the Geneva meetings?

The meeting was undoubtedly a significant event. Direct, clear and specific talks are useful; the opportunity to compare positions in a well-defined manner is useful. Too many explosive and acute problems had built up. We need to discuss these seriously and attempt to move out of the impasse.

We value the personal contact established with the U.S. President. A dialogue between top leaders is always a moment of truth in relations between states. It is important that such a dialogue has taken place. In the present difficult times it is, in itself, a stabilizing factor.

But we are realists and we must say straight out that at the meeting we did not succeed in finding solutions for the most important questions connected with ending the arms race. The unwillingness of the U.S. leadership to give up the "star wars" program made it impossible for specific accords to be reached at Geneva on real disarmament and, primarily, on the central problem of nuclear and space armaments. The meeting did not result in any reduction in the amount of armaments by both sides. The arms race is continuing. This cannot but cause disappointment.

The USSR and the United States are still divided by major differences on a number of other fundamental questions concerning the world situation and the development of events in individual regions. But we are far from belittling the importance of the accords reached in Geneva.

I will recall the most important of them. There is, first and foremost, the affirmation in the joint statement of the understanding held in common that nuclear war should never be unleashed and that there can be no victor in one, and the pledge by the USSR and the United States to structure their relations on the basis of this indisputable truth and not to strive for military superiority.

We consider that this understanding, jointly affirmed at summit level, should in practice be used as the basis for the foreign policy of the two states. The sooner it is recognized that by its very nature nuclear war cannot serve to achieve any rational aims, the stronger should be the incentive for preventing it, for ceasing the development and testing of means of mass annihilation, and for the total liquidation of the stockpiles of nuclear weapons. And the more impermissible it now is to open up new directions for the arms race. Of course, a joint statement is not a treaty. But it is a fundamental declaration of the positions of the leaders of the two countries, which imposes many obligations.



The USSR and the United States also confirmed in precise terms their pledge to promote the enhancement in every possible way of the effectiveness of the regime of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and came to an agreement on joint practical steps in that direction. In the current unsettled international situation this has no little significance for maintaining stability in the world, and reducing the risk of nuclear wars flaring up.

The joint statement of the leaders of the two countries in favor of a comprehensive and total ban on and destruction of such a barbaric weapon of mass destruction as chemical weapons, has fundamental significance. I would like to hope that the United States in its practical policies will follow this important understanding.

The accord of the leadership of the USSR and the United States to contribute jointly with other states participating in the Stockholm conference to its early completion by adopting a document which would include both concrete obligations on the non-use of force and also mutually acceptable measures for strengthening confidence, also goes far beyond the framework of Soviet-U.S. relations.

One can only welcome the fact that as a result of the meeting a number of useful accords in many areas for the development of bilateral cooperation between the USSR and the United States have appeared. I think that they will serve as a good base for raising the level of confidence between our countries and peoples, if of course one takes an attitude of care to what has been worked out, and if one develops everything good that is laid down in it and does not seek artificial reasons to refute it.

Special mention must be made of the significant of the accord achieved in Geneva on the continuation of political contacts between the Soviet Union and the United States, including new summit meetings.

Therefore, we are right in saying that the overall balance of Geneva is a positive one.

The achievement of such a reassuring result was undoubtedly to a decisive extent, helped by the constructive and consistent policies of our country. At the same time it would be unfair not to say here also that in the position of the U.S. side at the meeting, certain elements of realism came through, which contributed to the solution of a number of issues.

Of course, the real significance of everything useful that was agreed on in Geneva can only become manifest in practical deeds. In this connection I want to state that the Soviet Union for its part intends, with all determination and in the spirit of honest cooperation with the United States, to continue its attempts to achieve a curtailment of the arms race and a general improvement in the international situation. We are counting on such an approach being manifested also by the United States. I am sure the work carried out in Geneva will then bear real fruit (applause).

Such is our assessment of this event and its role in international relations. I am pleased to be able to say that this assessment is shared by our allies,

the fraternal socialist countries, as the meeting of the leaders by the Warsaw Pact member countries in Prague immediately after the conclusion of the Soviet-U.S. summit meetings most clearly indicated.

The participants in the Prague meeting emphasized that, naturally, the situation remains complex. The struggle to improve it continues but, and that we can say already now, the conditions under which it is waged have improved. The Geneva meeting is an important link in our long-term joint and closely coordinated efforts aimed at ensuring peace.

The natural question is this: what will happen in the future, in the light of the results of the Soviet-American dialogue in Geneva?

As I pointed out, we ascribe great importance to the agreement reached in Geneva of holding new Soviet-American summit meetings. I would like to stress that we do not approach this matter in a formal manner. What is important is not just the fact that there will be another meeting between the leaders of the two countries, but what its results will be. The peoples will await practical progress along the path outlined in Geneva; we shall strive towards precisely this. One must start preparing even now for the next Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, first and foremost in the sphere of practical policy.

In order not to make it more difficult to attain future accords, we are convinced that both sides must first and foremost refrain from actions which undermine what has been achieved in Geneva; they must refrain from the actions which would block negotiations and erode the existing factors limiting the arms race. This assumes, in particular, honest and precise observance of the agreement limiting antimissile defense systems, and further mutual observance by the sides of relevant provisions of SALT-II.

The main thing, however, is of course to create the possibility for a genuine halt to the arms race and to undertake practical steps to reduce the stockpiled nuclear arsenals.

Does such a possibility exist? We are firmly convinced that it does. It is true that at the present time our proposals and those of the United States on reducing weapons diverge in many respects. But we do not dramatize this fact. Compromise solutions are possible here, and we are ready to seek them.

There is no doubt that with such a development of events questions of reliable monitoring--in which the Soviet Union has a very direct interest--would also be resolved. One cannot rely on words here, all the more so when it is a question of disarmament and the country's defense.

But in order to solve all these questions it is absolutely vital to tightly close the door through which weapons might penetrate outer space. Without this, a radical reduction in nuclear armaments is impossible. I want to say this with all responsibility, on behalf of our people and its supreme power body (sustained applause).

An accord is attainable if it takes into account the interests of both sides. The stubborn desire of the American side to go on with the creation of space

weapons has only one end result--the blocking of the opportunity of ending the nuclear arms race. Naturally, such an outcome would give rise to bitter disappointment among the peoples of the whole world, including, I am sure, the American people.

Today there is a real opportunity to sharply reduce the threat of a nuclear war, and subsequently to totally eliminate the possibility of one. It would be a fatal mistake to let this opportunity pass. We hope that what was said in Geneva about the SDI is not the last word from the U.S. side.

President Reagan and I made an arrangement to instruct our delegations at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space armaments to speed up the talks and to conduct them on the basis of the January accord between the two countries. Thus, it has been reaffirmed by both sides at summit level: An arms race in outer space must be prevented by tackling this question in conjunction with a reduction of nuclear armaments. This is precisely what the Soviet Union will be striving for and this is precisely what we are urging the United States to emulate. By fulfilling in practice the commitments we have jointly undertaken, we will justify the hopes of the peoples of the whole world (sustained applause).

The longer it goes on, the more acute becomes the question of ending nuclear tests, first and foremost because an end would be put to the creation of new and the perfection of existing types of nuclear weapons. Because to proceed without testing without modernization, the process of the withering away of nuclear arsenals, the phasing out of nuclear weapons, would gradually proceed. Because, finally, it can no longer be permitted that nuclear explosions--they have amounted to hundreds--disfigure our beautiful earth, swelling the alarm as to how future generations will live on it.

That is why the Soviet Union announced its moratorium on all types of nuclear tests until January 1 1986 and is prepared to extend this moratorium if there is reciprocity from the U.S. side. We await from the U.S. leadership a concrete and positive decision which would have a very favorable effect on the whole situation, which would in many ways change it and would strengthen confidence between our countries.

We asked this question of the U.S. President in Geneva.

The answer was silence. In reality, there are no reasonable arguments against banning nuclear tests. In fact, there are no arguments at all. Sometimes reference is made to the difficulties of monitoring. But the Soviet Union has clearly demonstrated the possibility of the implementation of such monitoring by means of national facilities. This year we detected an underground nuclear explosion of extremely small capacity carried out by the United States and not announced by it. We are ready also to examine the possibility of setting up international monitoring. Deserving attention in this connection are the considerations submitted in the message from the six states proposing the creation on their territories of special stations for observing the fulfillment of an agreement on halting tests.

The whole world is raising its voice in favor of halting nuclear tests. At the UN General Assembly a resolution has just been passed calling for such a halt. Only three countries, the United States, Britain and France, voted against it. This is deeply regrettable.

There is still time. I think the leaders of the United States and other nuclear powers will make use of it proceeding from the interests of peace and their responsibility. Let me remind them that our moratorium remains in force, and we hope that the discussion of this matter by the USSR Supreme Soviet session will be seen as an appeal to come to a realistic and immediate banning of all nuclear tests.

Altogether, the Soviet Union proposes an all-embracing complex of measures which would block all the roads of the arms race, whether in space or on earth; whether in nuclear, chemical or conventional weapons. The specific proposals in this respect are known in Vienna, Geneva and Stockholm. They remain in force and retain all their topicality.

Europe should be mentioned separately. The task of preventing the further raising of the level of military confrontation is more acute here than ever before. The European house is a shared house, where geography and history have closely interlinked the fates of dozens of countries and their peoples. The Europeans can only preserve their house and make it better and safer only collectively, following the sensible standards of international intercourse and cooperation.

We proceed on the basis that Europe, which has given so much to the world in the fields of culture, science, technology and progressive social thought, is capable of setting an example also in solving the highly complex problems of contemporary international life. The foundations for this were laid 10 years ago in Helsinki. In the final analysis, we are most deeply convinced that the whole world, including the United States, will gain from the positive development of the situation in Europe. We have been working and shall continue to work for the more energetic consolidation on the long-suffering European Continent of the principles and policy of detente, for overcoming the obstructions of the past and the consequences of the confrontation of recent years.

I would like to make particular mention here of trade and economic relations. The business circles of many countries of the West would like to make wider economic contacts with us. I have heard from very influential representatives of these circles about this, of the readiness for large-scale contracts and readiness to begin large joint projects. And in my opinion, those politicians who try to put limitations on this natural desire for business cooperation, in the hope of "punishing" someone and doing damage to the other party are simply illogical. Such a policy long ago had its day. It is much more useful to employ one's efforts toward something else, with the aim of enabling commercial, scientific and technical exchanges to strengthen the material basis of agreement and trust.

In the struggle for stable peace and cooperation between peoples in Europe and other continents, we shall continue to cooperate closely with our allies in

the Warsaw Pact and with all the countries of the socialist community. The Warsaw Pact member states will never, under any circumstances, compromise the security of their peoples. To an increasing extent, they will also join their efforts within the framework of CEMA with the aim of speeding up scientific and technical progress and socioeconomic development.

Cooperation with the Nonaligned Movement, including all-round cooperation with the Republic of India, for whose people and leadership we have the profoundest respect, is of tremendous significance in making international relations more healthy (applause).

The Soviet leadership attaches serious significance to the Asian-Pacific area. The Soviet Union's longest borders are in Asia. There we have both true friends and reliable allies, from neighboring Mongolia to socialist Vietnam. It is extremely important to ensure that this area does not become a source of tension, a sphere of military confrontation. We are in favor of broadening political dialogue among all the states situated there, in the interests of peace, good neighborliness, mutual trust and cooperation.

We welcome the position of the PRC opposing the militarization of space as well as its statement refusing to make first use of nuclear weapons.

We are in favor of improving relations with Japan, confident that this is a real possibility. It stems from the simple fact alone that our countries are immediate neighbors. On this fundamental issue of removing the nuclear threat, the interests of the USSR and Japan cannot but coincide.

We have relations of equal cooperation with many states of Latin America, Africa and the Middle East. The Soviet Union will continue to work purposefully on developing these relations. We particularly value the close ties we have established with countries of a socialist orientation situated on various continents.

Today, the peoples of the whole world are faced with a multiplicity of issues, such as can only be resolved jointly and only under conditions of peace. Only a few decades ago, people had virtually no serious ecological problems. But our generation has been witness to the mass destruction of forests, disappearance of animals, pollution of rivers and lakes, broadening of desert zones. What kind of world will future generations see? Will they be able to live in it if we do not stop the predatory destruction of nature, if the economic, technical and scientific achievements of our age are turned not to the needs of securing conditions for existence and development of man, of the environment in which he dwells, but to perfecting the instruments of annihilation?

Or take the sphere of energy; so far we are living mainly on the resources of the bowels of the Earth. But, what was deposited near the surface is being exhausted and their further use is becoming more and more expensive and more and more difficult. Nor is this an endless source.

The growing gap between the handful of highly-developed capitalist countries and those developing countries--and they are the vast majority--whose fate is

poverty, famine and hopelessness also contains the seeds of dangerous upheavals. The gulf between these two world poles is becoming ever wider and the relations more and more antagonistic. They cannot be any other unless the developed capitalist countries change their egoistic policies.

The resolution of all these problems is within the powers of mankind if its efforts and intellect are joined. New heights in the development of civilization will then be accessible.

Militarism is hostile to the peoples; the arms race, which is whipped up by the thirst for profit by the military-industrial complex, is reckless. It strikes at the vitally important interests of all countries and peoples. This is why, when it is proposed to us that instead of destroying nuclear weapons we should spread the arms race to space as well, we say firmly: "No." We say "no" because that step would mark a new and senseless waste of means. We say "no" because this means increasing the danger hanging over the world. We say "no" because life itself requires not a contest in weapons, but joint action for the good of the world.

The Soviet Union is a resolute supporter of the development of international life in this direction (applause).

At the initiative of the USSR, and with the participation of scientists from various countries, development has begun of the Tokamak thermonuclear reactor project, which opens up the opportunity of a radical solution to the energy problem. According to the scientists it is possible even this century to create a "sun on earth," an inexhaustible source of the thermonuclear energy. We note with satisfaction that it was agreed in Geneva to continue this important work.

Our country has put forward for examination at the United Nations an extensive program for peaceful cooperation in space, for the creation of a world space organization which would coordinate the efforts of countries in space research and development. The possibilities for this are truly inexhaustible. They include basic scientific research and use of the results in the fields of geology, medicine, study of materials, they study of climates and the natural environment; the creation of a global satellite communications system and remote probing of the earth; finally, the creation and use of, in the interests of all peoples, new space technology, including big scientific orbital stations, various manned craft, and, in the long term, the industrialization of near-earth space. This is a real alternative to the "star wars" plans, aimed at a peaceful future for all mankind.

The Soviet Union came forward as one of the active participants in concluding an international convention on a system for the economic use of the resources of the world's oceans. The solution of this problem is also of great significance for securing progress in human civilization and for expanding and multiplying the capacities at the disposal of contemporary society.

We propose to the whole world, including the capitalist states, a wide, long-term and comprehensive program of mutual cooperation, bearing in mind those new opportunities which are opened for mankind by the era of the scientific



and technical revolution. And in implementing this program the cooperation, two states, such as the Soviet Union and the United States, could play a far from minor role.

Our policy is clear. It is a policy of peace and cooperation.

Comrades, the sources of the success of our foreign policy are in the internal nature of the socialist system. The Communist Party is well aware of and greatly values the support of the whole people for its domestic and foreign policy. This support is seen in the daily practical work of millions and millions of people. The results achieved in the economy are not just economic, but also most important moral and political, showing the correctness of the course we have taken.

Ahead of us are important and difficult matters. "But difficult," as the great Lenin taught, "is not the same as unachievable. Certainly in the correctness of choice of roads is important, and this certainty increases revolutionary energy and revolutionary enthusiasm hundredfold..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 11, p 93) This certainty, which multiplies our strength, exists in the party and in the Soviet people (sustained applause).

We are sure that every communist, every worker, every peasant, every engineer and scientist, every labor collective will fulfill their duty with an awareness of their great responsibility to the homeland.

We are sure that at every workplace everything will be done so that the plans for 1986 will be successfully fulfilled and overfulfilled, so that our country becomes even more wealthy and mighty and the cause of peace on earth becomes stronger and triumphs (tempestuous sustained applause).

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

CSO: 1802/5-F

# TRUTH OF AN ARDENT LIFE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 85 (signed to press 28 Nov 85) pp 50-61

[Article by L. Golovanov, written on the occasion of the 165th anniversary of Friedrich Engels' birth and 90th anniversary of his death]

[Text] If an age needs giants it unfailingly creates them. Such was the case in the first half of the 19th century as well. Truly gigantic personalities were needed to resolve the most difficult problems put on the agenda by life itself, personalities which were powerful not only because of their great learning but also their political activeness, as were, precisely, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. They made a literally conceptual revolution by giving natural science and social knowledge the necessary methodological foundations, shedding light on the truths of the future development of mankind. They created the science of society on the firm foundation of the dialectical-materialistic understanding of the historical process. "The chaos and arbitrariness which had prevailed until then in the views on history and politics," V. I. Lenin wrote, "were replaced by a strikingly specific and streamlined scientific theory which proved the way one system of social life leads, as a result of the growth of production forces, to the development of another, higher one..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 23, p 44). It is on the basis of that science that our Communist Party has structured and is structuring its policy, defining its immediate and longer-term objectives and correlating with them specific means of action.

We are mentioning this now as we note the memorable date of Engels' birth. His personality is inseparable from that of Marx. As brilliant philosophers and dedicated fighters for the cause of the liberation of labor from capitalist yoke, Marx and Engels theoretically substantiated the liberation struggle of the proletariat, pointing out the legitimate doom of the bourgeois system with all its contradictions and the alienation of labor and the exploitation of man by man, on the basis of the objective logic of the reaching by mankind of "an association in which the free development of each is a prerequisite for the free development of all" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch. [Works], vol 4, p 447). They armed the world working class with an understanding of its historical mission as the grave digger of capitalism and builder of a socialist society, laid the beginning of the organized international communist movement and proclaimed: "Workers of the world, unite!"

They stood at the origins of the theory of the party and its ideological and organizational foundations--the most important and inseparable part of their theory of the revolutionary struggle waged by the working class against the capitalist system and the building of a society of free labor. We turn to this great legacy with particular attention and gratitude today, when the discussion of the draft of the new editions of the CPSU program and bylaws and suggested changes is spreading everywhere. These documents are the concentrated expression of the main features which will determine the further development of all aspects of our life. "A new program," Engels wrote, "is always an unfurled banner and it is by this banner that the outside world judges the party ("Soch.", vol 19, p 6).

Our partial attitude toward the theoretical legacy and priceless practical experience of the great teachers is inseparable from the deepest feeling of respect we feel for them personally, for their amazingly rich and strong spirit and the example they set. How not to recall lines from Lenin's letter to Inessa Armand, dated January 1917: "I reread "Zur Wohnungsfrage" (Footnote --"On the Housing Problem." See K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 18, pp 203-284) by Engels, with his 1887 preface. Do you know what? It is charming! I continue to be "enamored" of Marx and Engels and cannot endure impassively any insults directed at them. No, these are real people! One must learn from them. We must not leave these grounds" (op. cit., vol 49, p 378).

It is particularly noteworthy that these philosophers, who were the first to formulate the question of the social ideal on a scientific basis, were themselves, essentially, a human ideal. A clear legitimate connection exists here: the perfection of creative thinking inseparable from all the features and characteristics of its creator, his moral consciousness in the first place. In the language of classical philosophy, it is in this unity that the reality of the person finds its manifestation in the supreme truth.

Engels' contemporaries unanimously considered him an outstanding personality, who embodied the supreme degree of comprehensive human development.

Raised and educated in a bourgeois environment at a time when the forces for its revolutionary negation were beginning to ripen within it, Engels reflected in the logic of his unusual destiny the birth of the new world. He was its harbinger by virtue of his personality. The development of typical circumstances, even those which, as may have seemed, would result in clearly anticipated results (such as the moral and material pressure of a factory-owning father, and the active influence of a religious environment) played an unforeseen role: the privileged conditions of a bourgeois life developed not their defender and perpetuator but their open and conscious opponent. Highly educated, with excellent manners, in excellent physical shape, inordinately active, exclusively motivated by lofty spiritual interests, he appeared to have all human qualities. His curiosity knew no bounds, for everything--literature, history, philology, philosophy, the natural sciences, music, the graphic arts, military affairs, sports--excited him. Everything echoed in his soul and inspired him to independent action.

However, service to the lofty social objectives of the age and revolutionary struggle for the communist future of mankind became the dominant feature of his life.

Engels was universally admired for his open and cheerful nature. He personally highly valued gaiety and a sense of humor. He lively reacted to a comical situation, apt word or naughty joke in any of the languages he knew (he was a real polyglot who had mastered more than 20 modern and ancient languages).

His goodness, responsiveness and invariable readiness to help others were captivating. He was the soul of any kind of meeting or group in which he participated. The hours spent in his company left most pleasant memories. "I would like to meet a person," Marx once exclaimed, "who would not consider Fred as lovable as he is educated!"

Genny, Marx's eldest daughter, kept in her album Engels' mock "Confession." To the question, "What is your distinguishing feature?," he answered: "To know everything halfway." "Your favorite occupation?" "To tease others and respond to teasing."

Those who knew him professionally ("mangy office work" -- see "Soch.", vol 29, p 52), saw him as a carefree, happy and witty interlocutor; his business obligations in Manchester involved not only commercial dealings but also attending parties and banquets, riding, hunting, etc., backed the opinion of those who considered him a "frivolous person."

Yet there also was another life, unknown to that type of world, a purposeful and intensive one, although, as Paul Lafargue had noted, "There had never been a less pedantic scientist than Engels." As to the claim of "knowing everything halfway," this was a joke, naturally: his passion for knowledge could be sated only when he, according to Lafargue, "had mastered the subject to its last detail." "Once you have gained even an idea of the amount and infinite variety of his knowledge, bearing in mind his active life, you are unwittingly amazed by the fact that Engels, who resembled least of all an ivory tower scientist, was able to acquire such an amount of knowledge."

Not only did he not "resemble" an ivory tower scientist: he was not one. In his modest lodgings in the outskirts of Manchester, where Engels spent most of his leisure time and where, as Marx said, "he felt himself free and...always could...escape human vileness" ("Soch.," vol 30, p 255), he met with friends and like-minded people and revolutionaries who had totally dedicated themselves to the struggle for the liberation of the working class.

Before he finally settled in England, he had his baptism of fire in the flames of the 1848-1849 revolutions. "Engels took part in the Baden uprising...," wrote Eleonora, Marx's daughter. "He fought in three battles, and those who saw him under fire spoke for a long time afterwards about his exceptional composure and absolute scorn of all danger."

He was simple and open in his actions. Regardless of the question, he always gave an unequivocal and persuasive answer. He never concealed his impartial

views regardless of the reaction of his interlocutor. Infinitely remote from puritanism, tolerant and lenient of human frailties, he looked at people and objects not through rose-tinted or dark glasses but through invariably clear and bright eyes. "...He never stopped at the surface of things," said Wilhelm Liebknecht, "but always plunged to their very depth."

Insincerity and falsehood were the greatest of sins in Engels' eyes. He did not forgive hypocrisy and felt profound disgust for sanctimoniousness. Vacillations and compromises were alien to him in matters of principle. He did not conceal his displeasure whenever he found something he disliked in party matters. He sharply criticized those who preached to the workers "socialism planing high above their class interests and class struggle, trying to reconcile for the sake of lofty humanism the interests of the opposing classes." "...Such people were either novices, who still had to learn a great deal or else the worst enemies of the workers, wolves in sheep's clothing" ("Soch.," vol 22, p 277).

Absolute honesty, truthfulness and sincerity in his assessments of all events, which were organically inherent in his character, reinforced his reputation among the broad circles of all those who knew him.

In his answer to Ferdinand Domele Nieuwenhuis on the question of the moral tie between individual actions and party ethics, Engels wrote: "...The decisive factor must be the impression which such an action on your part would create in your party comrades and the working masses who are still outside the party. Will worker public opinion remain indifferent to it or would it set it against the social democrats" (op. cit., vol 37, p 433). To Engels the interests of the party and the proletariat were the main criteria in the consideration of any problem.

Franz Mehring justly remarked that speculating on what would have become of Engels or Marx had they failed to meet is a waste of time. They were bound to meet, and it is up to their grateful descendants to assess the immortal deeds of these two mortal persons." We use our own "correction coefficient" in the case of Engels' self-assessment, considering his organic restraint in the matter of his own person (to the effect that in the duet "score" with Marx he played "second violin only," emphasizing his significance "only as an associate of the great man" -- see K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 36, p 188; vol 22, p 425) (addressed as "Dear Teacher!" by G.V. Plekhanov, Engels answered: "First of all, please stop praising me by calling me 'teacher.' I am simply called Engels (op. cit., vol 39, p 209). He did not tolerate intentional demonstrations of feelings and praises and shunned enthusiastic receptions). He played his "violin" not only "quite well" (his own words) but a solo "score" as well. After Marx's death he dedicated himself almost entirely to making the scientific accomplishments of his great friend universally known, setting aside his own creative intentions. To the end of his life he headed the world revolutionary movement, not only playing "first violin" in it but conducting the full orchestra as well.

As Lenin pointed out, "Engels was the first to say that the proletariat is not only a suffering class, and that it is precisely the shameful economic situation in which it finds itself that irrepressively urges it forward and

forces it to fight for its final liberation. The struggling proletariat will be able to help itself. The political movement of the working class will inevitably lead the workers to the awareness that they have no solution other than socialism. On the other hand, socialism will become a power only when it become the target of the political struggle of the working class (op. cit., vol 2, p 9). Even before the start of his close cooperation with Marx he had reached independently a number of valuable conclusions relative to the inner springs of the historical process, finding them in the antagonism between the economic interests of the classes pitted against each-other. The 23-year old Engels was the daring "path blazer" in the critique of bourgeois political economic thinking. He analyzed the economic structure of bourgeois society and the basic categories of bourgeois economic science in his first work on economics, "Outlines of the Critique of Political Economy" ("Soch.," vol 1, pp 544-571). Although this work is still not free from the influence of abstract "philosophical" communism, it is mainly an initial effort at a dialectical-materialistic analysis of the bourgeois social system and bourgeois social science. It is not without a reason that many years after the publication of this small first economic work by Engels, Marx, an already developed philosopher, was to describe it a "brilliant" (op. cit., vol 13, p 8).

It was precisely after "Outlines" appeared in the "German-French Yearbook" that Marx and Engels began to correspond and that a "steady epistolar exchange of views" was established (ibid.), which was the prologue of unparalleled friendship. "Communicating with Engels," Lenin wrote, "unquestionably contributed to Marx's decision to study political economy, the science in which his works led to an entire upheaval" (op. cit., vol 2, p 10).

By then Engels had already realized that private capitalist ownership was the root of the contradictions inherent in the material and spiritual life of bourgeois society. This understanding was developed later in his subsequent articles and the book "The Situation of the Working Class in England."

In "The Holy Family," their first joint work, Marx and Engels declared war on idealism, the separation of theory from living reality and material practice. Their concept that the mass, the people, are the true maker of history and that the wider and deeper the changes taking place in society become the larger must the mass making such changes be was of essential significance. They pointed out the close link between "idea" and "interest" as well as the "necessary link between the theory of materialism...and of communism and socialism" ("Soch.," vol 2, p 145).

This was followed by "German Ideology" on which the two friends worked from November 1845 to the summer of 1846, jointly formulating their integral dialectical and historical-materialistic concept as the philosophical foundation of communism.

The most important of the conclusions drawn in this work was that of the historical inevitability of a proletarian, a communist revolution. It was here that for the first time the idea of the need for the proletariat to gain political power was formulated. From a utopian ideal communism was being transformed into a scientific theory. "To us," Marx and Engels wrote, "communism is not a condition which must be established. It is not an ideal



which reality must take into consideration. We consider communism a real movement which is destroying the current condition" (ibid., vol 3, p 34).

During those stormy days of the 1840s, when the revolutionary movement was spontaneously growing in Europe, it was no accident that Marx and Engels emphasized the word "communism:" many "socialist" trends were extant. They included, on the one hand, supporters of various utopian systems and, on the other, all kinds of social soothsayers, who were attempting to heal social calamities with the help of all kinds of panaceas, like plasters and patches. "In both cases," Engels wrote, "these were people outside the labor movement, who were looking for support primarily among the 'educated' classes. Conversely, that segment of the workers who had realized the inadequacy of purely political change and demanded the radical reorganization of society was describing itself at that time as communist.... Socialism, at least on the continent, was entirely respectable already then, whereas the view on communism was the exact opposite. And since, already then, we firmly held the view that 'the liberation of the working class can be achieved only by the working class,' we did not question even for a minute which of the two we should select. Subsequently as well, it never even occurred to us to abandon it" (ibid., vol 22, p 62).

Along with intensifying the theoretical interpretation of vital problems, the partners undertook to work for the unification of the scattered revolutionary groups within a single movement on the basis of the ideology of the struggling working class and the founding of a proletarian party. In January 1846 they set up in Brussels a Communist Correspondents Committee, calling upon their supporters in other countries to set up similar committees with a view to organizing permanent contacts between socialist and communist groups and to formulate a joint strategy and tactics within the democratic movement and, in the future, to create an international communist organization.

In 1847 Marx and Engels joined the "Alliance of the Just," which they reorganized as the "Alliance of Communists," which was the prototype of the communist party. The question of the program for the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat was given first priority at the first congress of the "Alliance of Communists" (June 1847). A draft "Communist Symbol of Faith" was considered, written mainly by Engels. A significant portion of this document was subsequently included in Engels' "Principles of Communism," which became the foundation of the "Communist Party Manifesto." The greatest truth of history was expressed vividly and clearly, the truth of Marxism as a streamlined scientific theory of the revolutionary transformation of the world. "This small booklet," Lenin wrote, "is worth entire volumes: its spirit lives and drives to this day the entire organized and struggling proletariat in the civilized world" (op. cit., vol 2, p 10).

Such was, one could say, the harmony in the key of which the entire noble symphony of the lives of these two great people was to be played. Voluntarily dedicating himself to serving the working class, answering the call of his heart and the imperative of his mind, Engels never questioned the accuracy of the way he had chosen.

Years and years packed with intensive mental labor and tense political struggle.... This was the seed the fruit of which the founders of scientific communism were able to see, although the true harvest of a rich crop was to take place during the next, in our, century.

The ebbs and tides of revolutions came and went; upsurges of political passions alternated with declines; increased party unity of the proletarian vanguard was followed by divisions and quarrels, and outbreaks of mass enthusiasms with moral depressions... The tempestuous stream of daily events was conflicting and uneven. Laws revealing the natural course of economic and social progress, detected below the surface of phenomena, and confirmations of this discovery through social practice filled the mind with historical optimism and provided the necessary strength to pursue the struggle even during most unsettling times. Temporary retreats only increased the spiritual strength of the revolutionary fighters. Such was the case after the defeat of the 1848-1849 revolutions, the disbanding of the "Alliance of Communists" and the fall of the Paris Commune... The periods of apparent calm were used to interpret the past stage, the nature of the protagonists and the social relations which determined their struggle.

In August 1871 one of Engels' Spanish correspondents wrote to him that "...Noting the enthusiasm with which you, despite your age, are showing for the great cause of the International, I too become inflamed with enthusiasm for such work, and nurture the hope that, although my hair is turning gray and my head is bending under the weight of the years, there is enough fire in my heart to zealously pursue the cause, until I can see the crumbling into the dust of that society of inequality which forces us to live like pack animals."

As member of the General Council of the International Association of Workers (the International), together with Marx Engels played a leading role in heading the first independent international organization of the proletariat.

The landmarks in the lives of Marx and Engels are landmarks of a large slice of European revolutionary history, and everything written by them--not only political articles and theoretical studies but personal correspondence as well--an exciting chronicle of the age. The doctrine they substantiated, nurtured by new facts and enriched with new conclusions, steadily developed and strengthened. Consistent with the interests and aspirations of the struggling proletariat, it met with a tremendous sympathy on the part of the latter, undesired and unexpected by official bourgeois (governmental and liberal) science. However, Marxism contained nothing resembling "sectarianism" in the sense of some kind of closed and ossified doctrine established on the shoulder of the high road of history. On the contrary, the entire brilliance of this doctrine was that it gave true answers to questions already raised by social practice.

Interest in theoretical problems increased once again during the 1870s, with the start of the new stage in the labor movement, when socialist parties began to be established, to grow and to mature in all developed capitalist countries. This was also necessary in order to clarify the lessons learned from the Paris Commune. Engels decisively fought against the nonproletarian trends, such as Lassallianism, Prudhonism and Bakuninism. After Marx's

"Poverty of Philosophy, his outstanding political work "On the Housing Problem" was one of the most significant rejections of petit bourgeois and bourgeois socialism in its most typical manifestations. In this work Engels firmly criticized the abstract understanding of the categories of "right" and "justice," described as ignorance and helplessness views that social phenomena were unrelated to material economic conditions and mocked statements on the possibility of perfecting morality and law without encroaching on capitalist property. According to the author, the real solution of the housing or any other social problem affecting the fate of workers, rested only in the elimination of the capitalist production method and in the working class itself taking over all means of existence and labor.

His work indicated the link between the ways and means of making social changes and specific circumstances. It has retained its essential significance to this day in the struggle against both "left-wing" sectarianism and right-wing opportunism.

The peak of Engels' theoretical struggle for the ideological foundations of a workers' party was his critique of the pretentious system formulated by Berlin Privatdocent Eugene Duhring. Its result, to cite the author himself, was an "encyclopedia outline of our understanding of philosophical, natural scientific and historical problems ("Soch.," vol 36, p 119). The work offered an integral and clear presentation of the three components of Marxism: complete philosophical materialism, the living soul of which is dialectics; political economy, understood in the broad meaning of the term as the "science of the laws governing the production and exchange of vital material goods in human society" (ibid., vol 20, p 150), and scientific communism as the theory of the revolutionary liberation struggle of the working class, establishing its universal historical role as the builder of a socialist society. These parts are interrelated and interdependent.

In criticizing Duhring's reactionary petit bourgeois views, in themselves insignificant but for the dangerous infection which his ideas could trigger among the conscious segment of the members of the German labor movement, Engels defended the foundations of a revolutionary-proletarian truly first-rate thinking aimed at reaching objective truth, the truth of science and life. It was not for nothing that Lenin described "Anti-Duhring" (alongside Engels' work "Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy") the "bedside reading of any conscientious worker" (op. cit., vol 23, p 43).

Engels convincingly proved that dialectical materialism alone offers the possibility of avoiding the theoretical difficulties facing the mind at each new stage in its development. It is precisely "Ariadne's thread," without which creative thinking is threatened by the danger of becoming confused in the cleverly woven processes and phenomena in the objective world and their most complex interactions and changes. Engels saw in dialectics "an analogue and, therefore, a method for explaining the development of natural processes, the universal links within nature and the transition from one area of research to another" ("Soch.," vol 20, p 367).

The classical presentation of the laws of dialectics provided in "Anti-Duhring" has been included in all textbooks and popular publications on

Marxist philosophy. The book provides a clear description of these laws and explains the most important categories in dialectics. It is an irreplaceable aid in mastering Marxist methodology and a trusty ideological weapon of the working people in the struggle against a bourgeois outlook and all kinds of deviations from Marxism.

As a literary work "Anti-Duhring" is a classical model of communist publicism, literally devastating the ideological opponent with outstandingly apt words. Here depth of content, accuracy of expression of ideas, impeccable argumentation and logical order of thought are frequently combined with mercilessly trenchant irrefutable assessments. All of this reveals Engels' very character, the thoroughness of his erudition and his combative and decisive spirit. He does not shy at mocking the mental limitations and excessive pretentiousness of the philistine who dares to speak of his "system-creation," supported by nothing but highfaluting idle talk, which is, as Engels said, the most typical and widespread product of bourgeois intellectual industry. "Here," he wrote, "we are dealing with an infantile disease which confirms the beginning of the transition of the German intellectual to the side of the social democrats and is indivisible from this process. Bearing in mind their healthy nature, our workers will unquestionably surmount it" (ibid., p 7).

As subsequent historical experience was to confirm, this "infantile disease" was to reappear again and again, albeit in other forms, in subsequent generations of supporters of socialism. Alas, its "virus" is to this day circulating in the veins of civilization, while in the ideological arsenal of prophylactic and healing medicines Engels' brilliant work would retain its permanent value and the "healthy nature" of the revolutionary workers' movement would repeatedly confirm its resistance to the "infection."

The logic of philistinism is always one and the same: intellectual limitation motivated by vaingloriousness and relying on trite "radical innovation," progressing toward "philosophical" baseness, "scientific" or political fraud and rejection of progress, knowledge and truth.

The entire history of the subsequent development of the international communist movements is imbued with the struggle for the purity of revolutionary theory, misrepresented deliberately or not. The fierceness of such misrepresentations increased during periods of aggravated general political situations.

The instructiveness of "Anti-Duhring" and of everything written by Engels lies in its consistently pursued materialism and historicism and the exposing of idealism, metaphysics and eclecticism. The leader of the proletariat cautioned against the arbitrary structuring of theoretical relations based on a priori concepts which are then made part of empirical facts. "Such relations must be based on facts and we must find out, while proving them, the extent to which this is empirically possible" (ibid., p 371). Some of today's theoreticians, who tend to absolutize their speculative models and presents abstractions as reality should bear this in mind.

Marxism teaches us to consider the future higher quality of the social system not as the embodied revelation of one superlative mind or another but as the necessary result of the struggle against opposite classes, as the need to study the historical and economic process, the legitimate consequence of which was these classes and their struggle, and the real situation based on said processes, and try to find means for resolving the conflict. "...The final reasons for all social changes and political turns of events," we read in "Anti-Duhring," "should be sought not in the heads of the people or their increased understanding of the eternal truth and justice but in changes in the means of production and exchange. They must be sought not in the philosophy but in the economics of their age" (ibid., p 278). The means used in eliminating the social evil "must not be an invention of the mind but discovered in the existing material production factors" (ibid.).

The theoretical emotional content of this outstanding work is found in the aspiration of the mind toward the future society free from private-ownership relations and all forms of exploitation and oppression, a society in which the objective forces of social progress will act "under the control of the people themselves," and in which "the people will learn fully consciously to create their own history by themselves" ("Soch.," vol 19, p 228). Engels did not limit the task of political economy to the study of the laws governing the capitalist system alone, but pointed out that one of its most important purposes is "to discover within the decaying economic form of motion the elements of the future new organization of production and exchange..." (ibid., vol 20, p 153). In developing Marx's ideas on the dialectical interaction among production, exchange and distribution, Engels substantiated the materialistic principle of the dependence of the distribution of the product on the production and trade method, as the foundation of any social system.

His profound understanding of all occurring events strengthened his conviction that the mass production forces which had developed under the conditions of the capitalist production methods and the further development of which the bourgeoisie would be unable to control "would take over the society organized for joint planned work, in order to provide all the members of the society with means of existence and the free development of their capabilities on an increasing scale" (ibid., p 154).

Therefore, having freed manpower from its commodity status, the new social system would subordinate the development of all public production to ensuring the full well-being and free and comprehensive physical and spiritual development of all members of society.

"When society becomes the owner of the means of production and uses them for production purposes in a directly socialized manner, the work of every individual, however different its specifically useful nature may be, will become, from the very start, direct social labor" (ibid., p 321). This, in Engels' view, will open the possibility of radical changes in the distribution mechanism, no longer needing the services of value as a specific quantity of abstract labor used in the production of the commodity and materialized in this commodity. Value, Engels pointed out, conceals within itself not only money but increasingly developed forms of commodity production and exchange, and is the embryo of all capitalist production relations. "To wish to destroy



the capitalist production form with the help of the establishment of 'true value' is like trying to destroy Roman Catholicism by electing a 'true' pope or trying to create the type of society in which, finally, producers will control their own product through the systematic application of an economic category, which would be the broadest possible manifestation of the fact that the producers have become enslaved by their own product" (ibid., p 322).

The practice of the establishment and development of real socialism confirms in the main Engels' scientific forecast concerning the historical destinies of commodity output. The elimination of private capitalist appropriation put an end to the commodity form of manpower. A single planning principle became firmly established in the national economy, eliminating the rule of uncontrolled commodity output. The draft of the new edition of the CPSU program calls for the need to "use commodity-monetary relations in accordance with the new content inherent in them under socialism, to strengthen the fiscal-crediting system, to increase the purchasing power of the ruble, to strengthen the regimen of savings and work quantity and quality control, and make more efficient use of the entire arsenal of economic levers and incentives." The theory and practice of planned economic management must proceed from the fact that these relations are subordinated to the direct social foundations of the socialist system and the fundamental principles of our economy in developing the methods for the rational use of commodity-monetary relations.

In mocking speculative economic systems, Engels wrote in "Anti-Duhring" that "Naturally, production is an area in which we are dealing with tangible facts and in which 'rational imagination' may allow only a minimal scope for the flight of its free soul, for the danger of covering oneself with shame is too great" ("Soch.," vol 20, p 310). Even greater irony abounds in the writings on distribution, which also contain a warning to specialists who could become carried away. As society advances, the responsibility of science to it increases, particularly when public production based on a single plan becomes possible and the implementation of social actions related to realized objective laws assumes a global nature, i.e., when the "leap of mankind from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom" takes place (ibid., p 295). Engels left to us to study the historical conditions and the very nature of such a leap, i.e., the conditions and nature of the plan which the working class is called upon to implement, which is the task of scientific communism.

Engels' works on philosophy also embody long years of study of the social sciences and an active and purposeful interest in practical and theoretical discoveries in most varied scientific areas. "He is a real encyclopedia," said Marx in referring to his friend ("Soch.," vol 28, p 505). His encyclopedic knowledge and ability easily to switch from one subject to another were combined with his masterly skill not to become lost in details and, in the chaos of innumerable phenomena, to detect the dialectical laws of motion, to detect the dialectical laws of motion appearing within a seeming randomness of events. Even prior to his polemical work on the "upheaval" in nature, caused by Mr Duhring, he had undertaken the writing of "The Dialectics of Nature," which dealt with identifying the dialectics of natural science and a critique of metaphysical and idealistic views in the natural sciences. By



the time he had to interrupt work on this subject he had already written about 100 notes and fragments. It is here that we see an ardent revolutionary in science. Having rescued, together with Marx, conscious dialectics from German idealistic philosophy, he moved it to the materialistic understanding of nature. This exploit alone would have ensured his immortality. In fact, he gave science its self-awareness, the awareness of its social and gnosiological nature, the correlation between philosophy and the natural sciences and the subordination of matter to various forms of motion and with it a proper classification of the basic areas of knowledge. Engels determined the action of dialectical laws and categories in nature and proved the need for a dialectical-materialistic method in the natural sciences.

"Nature," he wrote, "is the testing stone for dialectics, and we must say that contemporary natural science has supplied us for such testing exceptionally rich data, increasing with every passing day, therewith proving that, in the final account, everything occurring in nature is dialectical and not metaphysical" ("Soch.," vol 20, p 22).

Engels also proved the dialectical nature of knowledge, aspiring toward absolute truth and consisting of the sum of relative truths.

Contemporary natural science, the unquestionable successes of which are tremendous along its entire front, can learn from Engels a great deal. His statement in his "Old preface to 'Anti-Duhring.' On dialectics" remains pertinent to this day: "...In natural science itself we quite frequently come across theories in which real relations are set upside-down, in which reflection is taken for the reflected object, and which, therefore, need to be turned right-side up" (ibid., p 371). Thus, some careless hypotheses, and fabricated schemes or models are sometimes presented as "reality," on the basis of which tall illusory installations are erected and used as topics of heated debates and even as top[ics of self-seeking indiscriminate "scientific" research of nothing. Theoretical thinking is not inherent but can only be developed on the basis of the conscious mastery of the science of thinking, i.e., of dialectical materialism. Neither the natural nor humanitarian sciences can withstand the struggle against false ideas without a firm philosophical substantiation.

After Marx's death Engels assumed the burden of leader of the international workers' movement. On a parallel basis he undertook a truly gigantic project: sorting out the manuscripts and preparing the second and third volumes of Marx's "Das Kapital" for publication. It was during that period that he wrote new fundamental works, such as "Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State," and "Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy," which enriched the treasury of Marxism with new ideas and concepts.

His correspondence on problems of historical materialism was of great importance. Its main thrust is the aspiration to protect Marxism from being vulgarized and from changes in emphasis (in particular, reducing it to economic materialism), demagoguery and pseudorevolutionary phraseology. In his answer to one of the leaders of the "young," Engels wrote that "the materialistic method turns into its opposite when it is used not as a

guideline in historical research but as a ready-made pattern with which historical facts are cut and recut" ("Soch.," vol 22, p 86).

In his printed works, letters and private conversations Engels tirelessly explained the creative nature of Marxism, essentially incompatible with a separation of theory from practice and historical experience, emphasizing the need to enrich theory with new conclusions. How can we avoid referring to Lenin in this matter: "One cannot understand Marxism and explain it in its integrity without reading all of Engels' works" (op. cit., vol 26, p 93).

A.M. Voden, the Russian literary worker and translator and member of the social democratic circles of the beginning of the 1890s, recalls that once Engels expressed the wish that young social democrats not select quotes from Marx and himself, but think the way Marx would. "It is only in this sense that the term 'Marxist' has a *raison d'etre*."

Like a tuning fork, this recollection gives our minds the necessary tonality which, like everything else we know about Engels, is the more important when we remember that he was one of the rarest historical heroes whose personal greatness equals the social significance of their exploits.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/5

TOWARDS THE 27TH PARTY CONGRESS -- DISCUSSION OF CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE DRAFTS

EXACTINGNESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 85 (signed to press 28 Nov 85) pp 62-73

[Article by B. Arkhipov]

[Text] The rural rayon party committees play a major role and have great responsibility in resolving the difficult large-scale problems raised by life. Currently there are 3,200 such committees in the country, totaling more than 49,000 kolkhoz and sovkhos party organizations and 6.5 million party members or one-third of the party's entire membership. "With such a force and vanguard," noted M. S. Gorbachev at the conference of the party and economic aktiv in Tselinograd, "truly great accomplishments are possible in the production and social areas. The party's Central Committee highly values the activities of this most important link in our party and the contribution which the party committees are making in the implementation of the party's political course and, in particular, the implementation of the Food Program."

A specific, thorough and interested discussion on the activities of the leading organ of the rayon party organization, party soviet and economic cadres and rank-and-file party members for the implementation of the party's policy, the Food Program and the decrees of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers on the further development of the Nonchernozem was held at the 27th Vologodskiy Rayon Party Conference, on 16 November 1985. Both the accountability reports submitted by the CPSU raykom, delivered by G. N. Kolpakov, raykom first secretary, and the discussions which followed, concentrated on problems of the party's management of the economy and provided a self-critical analysis of the extent to which the party organizations had successfully resolved crucial problems of rayon economic and cultural development and the skill with which they HAD carried out organizational work among the masses.

In listening to the accountability report and the delegates' speeches, one could not help but think of the fact that the spirited yet emphatically businesslike atmosphere which predominated at the conference was the direct result of the process of positive changes which was gathering strength and the beginning of which could be traced to the resolutions of the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. The mood of the rayon party members clearly revealed their firm resolve to make a worthy contribution to the implementation of the party's strategy of accelerating the country's

socioeconomic development on the basis of scientific and technological progress, comprehensive strengthening of discipline, order and organization, further development of creative initiative and upgrading the activeness of the working people. Concern for the fastest possible social restructuring of the Vologda countryside and the further enhancement of its production forces was, naturally, what governed the thoughts of the conference's participants in the first place.

Agriculture is the leading economic sector in Vologodskiy Rayon. Anyone familiar with problems of agricultural production is aware of the difficulties which agriculture is experiencing in the north. However, even under the present difficult circumstances, the rayon working people, relying on the ever increasing assistance of the state, were able substantially to increase the output of fields and livestock farms during the past 5-year period.

Both the report and the speeches by the 16 delegates who addressed the conference expressed pride in the successes achieved in the development of the rayon's agriculture. This feeling, as we could see, was fully justified. Arriving in the Vologda area one week before the conference, on the journal's assignment, together with personnel with the party obkom and raykom I was able to visit five sovkhoses, the Mobile Mechanized Column No 7 of the Vologdameliorskiy Association, the Northwestern Scientific Research Dairy and Pasture Farming Institute and the dairy combine and to talk with secretaries of primary party organizations, farm and enterprise managers, milkmaids, mechanizers, construction workers, reclamation workers, workers in the processing industry and scientific workers. On-site familiarization with the organization of the production process, numerous talks with the people and attending the proceedings of the conference helped me to understand more profoundly the reasons for the successes achieved by the rayon rural workers in their difficult current work.

Although the weather was not favorable to the farmers, during the 5-year plan period labor productivity in agriculture increased 26.5 percent and the volume of output of agricultural commodities in the rayon increased by a factor of 1.3. The 5-year assignments for sales of milk, meat, eggs, grain, potatoes, vegetables, vitamin meal and hay to the state were overfulfilled. Compared with similar indicators for the 10th Five-Year Plan, average annual output of basic commodities from farming and animal husbandry increased by the following amounts: grain, 14,600 tons or 28 percent; potatoes, 15,000 tons or 70 percent; vegetables, 5,000 tons or 42 percent; milk, 3,700 tons or 5 percent; meat, 6,600 tons or 56 percent; fodder, 36,500 tons of fodder units, or 54 percent.

As was pointed out at the conference, an increase was shown not only in the quantitative indicators of the implementation of the 5-year plan for sales of agricultural commodities to the state. A significant improvement in quality was achieved. For example, compared with the preceding 5-year period, first grade milk sales increased 46 percent; sales of above-average weight cattle reached 89 percent and the average delivered weight per head of cattle increased from 440 to 460 kg. During the 5-year period sales of high-quality grain crops to the state increased by 45 percent.

The conclusion reached both in the accountability report and the speeches of the participants in the conference led to the conclusion that the rayon had been making more energetic use of intensive factors of economic growth. Actually, increased gross output of crops was ensured on virtually the same planted areas as a result of higher yields. Whereas during the 10th Five-Year Plan the average annual grain crop was 17.8 quintals per hectare, it reached 22.6 quintals during the 11th Five-Year Plan. Substantial increases were noted also in crops such as potatoes (from 90 to 135 quintals), vegetables (from 207 to 309 quintals) and perennial grass hay (from 23 to 333 quintals).

The same applies to animal husbandry. Whereas in 1980 there were 24,140 cows in the rayon, by 1985 there were only 23,810. However, milk production increased, for during the 5-year plan period milk per fodder-fed cow increased by 886 kg and is expected to reach 3,700 kg in 1985. The average daily weight increase in cattle for fattening reached 1,096 grams.

The increased volume of agricultural commodities sold to the state and their improved quality enabled the rayon farms significantly to increase their income. Rayon income growth averaged 5.5 million rubles annually. The level of profitability increased from 28 percent in 1980 to 39 percent in 1985. Over the past 5 years the farms' basic production capital increased by 47 percent. Naturally, all of this had a positive influence on the implementation of production plans, the sale of agricultural products to the state, and the implementation of the planned program for social changes. In accordance with the program, 38 million rubles had been invested in the development of the social area.

Let us, at this point, stop enumerating the successes achieved by the rayon working people, the more so since, I repeat, the participants in the conference rated their accomplishments quite modestly. However, they spoke freely a great deal and sharply of things which had not been done too well, which had been done poorly or had not been done at all; they spoke of their own omissions and of those of their partners in the agroindustrial complex and of the reserves available at each farm and enterprise, which should be utilized sooner in order to ensure the sharp upsurge of the agrarian sector of the economy, agricultural production intensification and its increased efficiency. One could feel that the people were discussing something that was touching them and was close to their hearts, something they had thought about a great deal, and that they had been motivated to address the conference by their zealous interest in the success of their common cause.

The rayon party committee, its buro and G. N. Kolpakov, its first secretary, were criticized above all for the unstable work of the rayon, for the fact that the results of economic activities have been fluctuating quite tangibly during the individual years of the 5-year period and that work indicators greatly varied from one farm to another. The accountability report, for example, self-critically noted that during the first 2 years of the 5-year period the rayon had not fulfilled its plans for the sale of milk to the state and the 5-year plan for the sale of flax. Although the 5-year plan for the sale of potatoes to the state had been fulfilled, the 1985 assignment had not.

Unquestionably, the annual fluctuations in volumes of output and sales were affected by the whims of the weather, which was exceptionally adverse over the last 5 years. "But how can we explain," M. F. Sychev, second secretary of the CPSU obkom said at the conference, "that even during the worse weather conditions, in some years neighboring farms can show very different results? How to explain that even during the worse seasons the Rodina Kolkhoz, whose chairman, for many years, has been Twice Hero of Socialist Labor M. G. Lobytov, delegate to the conference, obtains relatively stable crops? Naturally, here as well results fluctuate according to the weather. However, they are neither so drastic nor as significant as they are in other farms. For example, the Rodina Kolkhoz averaged 48.5 quintals per hectare grain crop in 1982, 43 in 1983 and 54.5 in 1984. During the 11th Five-Year Plan the kolkhoz averaged 42.2 quintals per hectare per year. Meanwhile Borisovskiy Sovkhoz averaged 18.8, Striznevskiy Sovkhoz averaged 17 and Kipelovskiy Sovkhoz averaged 16.5 quintals per hectare. In other words, there was an almost 100 percent difference in the indicators of the best and the worst farms in the rayon. What this proves is that the weather is one thing and work is something else! Naturally, the weather influences the crops. So what? Should we simply sympathize with one another and cry in our vests? All this would give is that the vests would get wet and this would not yield more grain or other products. We obviously will not change the climate. However, we can and must adapt agriculture to its features and reduce the harmful influence of adverse weather conditions!..."

That is precisely the way the leading rayon farms are working, and not only they! Party member G. K. Shilovskiy convincingly spoke on what a great deal can be done with a view to eliminating as soon as possible the still existing disparities in farm production results and what great possibilities they have for economic upsurge. Five years ago, on 7 January 1981, he took over the Belovskiy Sovkhoz. During the 10th Five-Year Plan the farms' annual crops averaged 9.9 quintals per hectare; perennial grasses averaged 21 quintals and hay from natural meadows, 6 quintals. In 1980 that dairy sovkhoz had averaged no more than 1,830 kilograms per cow and sold the state 1,487 tons of milk only. That year 100 tons of meat had been sold to the state. This year, which was by no means good from the weather point of view, grain crops averaged 17.6 quintals per hectare, perennial grass hay averaged 59 quintals and hay from natural meadows 18 quintals. Milk per fodder-fed cow averaged 3,250 kilograms (which means that over the past 5 years milk production per cow had increased by 1,420 kilograms!). A total of 2,700 tons of milk (1,213 tons than in 1980) and 165 tons of meat, compared to 100 in 1980, had been sold to the state.

The farm, G. K. Shilovskiy said at the conference, can significantly increase its output. The abundance of procured fodder, which had to be purchased from neighboring farms until 1981, enables the sovkhoz to increase its milk herd by at least 200 cows. For the time being, however, there are no premises where to put them. A new livestock farm must be built and the existing dairy complex where cows are yielding significantly less milk than at other sovkhoz farms because of poor raising conditions, should be reconstructed.

In terms of the long-term accelerated development of Vologodskiy Rayon in the 12th Five-Year Plan, the example set by Belovskiy Sovkhoz is of exceptional



importance. This example confirms the realistic nature of the tasks set at the 27th accountability and election rayon conference: raising the lagging farms to the average rayon level. What would this yield?

The answer to this question, included in the accountability report, was quite impressive. Raising the lagging farms to the average level means obtaining additionally 7,000 tons of milk, 8,500 tons of grain, 3,500 tons of potatoes and 2,500 tons of vegetables. Was this much or little? It was precisely the increased volume of gross output planned for the rayon for the 12th Five-Year Plan. Consequently, even assuming that the leading and average rayon farms would no longer improve and that their output would remain on its previous level, the increased annual volume of gross agricultural output by an average of 14-16 percent, stipulated in the draft Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR, could be attained. Yet neither the leading nor the average farms intend to maintain their previous levels! In a word, urging on the lagging farms to reach the level of the average and progressive ones is a most important economic and political task. As the proceedings of the conference indicated, the Vologodskiy Rayon party organization is fully resolved to persistently to work for its implementation.

#### Limits of Growth

To resolve this problem means, first of all, to reach high yields from everything at the disposal of the working people in agriculture and the overall rayon agroindustrial complex. The level of capital returns here remains low and, here and there, volumes of agricultural output have even declined despite a substantial improvement in the availability of capital assets. The accountability report and the speeches gave many examples of neglect of productive capital, careless attitude toward the qualitative renovation of active assets, and carelessness in the use of equipment, buildings and systems. Suffice it to say that on an average the rayon's tractor fleet is in working condition 60 percent of the time during the year and that the coefficient of utilization of automotive transport facilities does not exceed 50 percent.

In his speech, N. V. Uglov, mechanizer at the Iskra Sovkhoz, criticized the rayon Selkhoztekhnika Association service for poor maintenance of agricultural machinery. The tractor assigned to him broke down in March. All that needed to be replaced were the bushings of the bearings of the connecting rod. He could have made the repairs himself in a few days had he been able to obtain the part from the rayon Selkhoztekhnika warehouse. However, concerned with its own advantages, the association asked that the engine be sent to its own workshop for repairs. The engine was returned to the sovkhos only in June, virtually dismantled. It took more than 1 month to complete the so-called repair. This is a typical example in all respects. The conference demanded of the party raykom firmly to increase its strictness toward party members employed in the engineering rayon services in organizing the work of the rayon organizations providing repairs and technical servicing.

Delegates to the conference also mentioned the unsatisfactory use of totally operational machinery at the rayon farms. That same Iskra Sovkhoz purchased a silage harvesting complex with a productivity of 47 tons of silage per hour.

Yet, that same N. V. Uglov, the mechanizer to whom this machine was entrusted, was able to harvest no more than 20-30 tons daily for the simple reason that the sovkhos administration had neglected to assign vehicles for the transportation of the silage.

Another rather indicative fact was mentioned at the conference. Mechanizers from the Rodina Kolkhoz went to Striznevskiy Sovkhos to help with the harvest. The guests were able to thrash up to six bunkersfull of grain per day, while their host, operating under the same weather conditions, one. The following figures as well make us think: in a given farm, with identical availability of spare parts, some mechanizers can operate their machines for 10 to 12 years while others, for 3 to 4 years only.

Serious grievances were expressed toward party members in organizations engaged in construction work in the countryside. They were blamed most frequently for leaving projects unfinished. For example, at the Severnaya Ferma Sovkhos, the farm workers are unable to occupy two almost finished five-story residential buildings only because the boiler room has not been completed. A livestock complex was built at the Iskra Sovkhos but the personnel to service it has no housing. Although money for housing construction has been appropriated, construction is proceeding at such a slow pace that the houses will be completed no less than 5 years hence. The premise of a control-testing station with a dehydration shop has been under construction at the Krasnaya Zvezda Sovkhos for the past 7 years, although financing for the construction project has been uninterrupted.

The time has come firmly to undertake the reconstruction of animal husbandry premises in the farms and to replace long obsolete equipment. There simply is no other way for ensuring the fast and substantial increase in labor productivity in animal husbandry and improving the working conditions of livestock breeders. Yet it is a known fact that contracting construction organizations are extremely unwilling to undertake the reconstruction of old production premises. The only hope here is for the farms to build such premises themselves. However, in terms of construction to this day virtually everywhere, and even more so in the countryside, construction without outside help is like the situation in which Zolushka found herself. Vologodskiy Rayon is no exception.

T. A. Shishova, secretary of the Order of Lenin party committee at the Krasnaya Zvezda Sovkhos, described the reconstruction of the hog breeding complex, whose planned production capacity was for 1,240 tons of pork annually, by the sovkhos itself. After the reconstruction, production rose to about 3,000 tons within the same premises. Although this was profitable, it cost a great deal to the sovkhos personnel! Materials and equipment had to be procured with tremendous difficulty! Without outside help the sovkhos could increase the productivity of the hog breeding complex to 3,500 tons. But where to find the necessary iron, pipes and cement? Merely to maintain the 22 buildings of the complex in normal operating conditions requires 50 cubic meters of industrial concrete monthly. Yet all the sovkhos is allocated is two freight cars of cement annually. As to the rest, do the best you can! What is most striking, T. A. Shishova said, is that the planning bodies do not even have the necessary standards which would enable them to compute the

amounts of construction materials needed by the sovkhoses to maintain existing premises and to reconstruct them. The same concern was voiced by V. P. Roslyankov, director of the pure-bread Poultry Sovkhoz imeni Mozhayskiy.

Ye. V. Maslova, brigade leader at the instruments basic production sector of the Vologda Dairy Combine, said that at the bottling section, over the past 2 years the old equipment has been entirely replaced. This has significantly improved the working conditions of the workers and increased productivity. The combine did the entire reconstruction itself, without stopping the work of sections and shops or lowering volumes of output. Four other sections will be reconstructed during the 12th Five-Year Plan, totally replacing the equipment at the cost of 670,000 rubles.

During the current 5-year plan period the combine's leadership repeatedly requested the help of superior organizations in drafting all the necessary designs. S. F. Antonov, at that time USSR minister of meat and dairy industry, and V. S. Konarygin, his republic colleague, visited the combine and met with the collective. Both leaders promised the workers to help the combine with housing construction, the need for housing being exceptionally urgent here, and to allocate for the 12th Five-Year Plan, for reconstruction purposes, new equipment, including automated milk distribution pipes, machines for packaging sour cream and cottage cheese in polystyrene packages, high-efficiency pasteurizing systems, and containers for the manufacturing of sour milk products. To this day, however, virtually nothing has been done to keep these promises.

"As a working person and a communist," Ye. V. Maslova said in conclusion, "I find it insulting and strange when I see the way the words of comrades in such high position could be so different from their actions. In my view, if you can do something, promise it and keep your promise. If you cannot, you may refuse but support your refusal so that the people can understand that for the time being the problem cannot be resolved..."

Others who were sharply criticized at the conference were V. A. Flegondov, raykom second secretary, the party members of the construction department of the CPSU obkom and the oblast executive committee for their lack of exigency concerning the managers of construction organizations, who are upsetting the plans for the construction of projects in the countryside, formulated in accordance with the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decrees on the Nonchernozem and the frequent and not always justified transfer of construction workers from one rayon to another and from site to site.

The view of the need to convert more daringly to new and progressive technologies and to seek more persistently more efficient means of utilization of material resources and concentrating them in areas where they could yield the highest returns, ran throughout the accountability reports submitted by the raykom and the speeches of the delegates.

In their speeches, M. G. Lobytov, chairman of the Order of the Labor Red Banner Rodina Kolkhos, M. F. Sychev, CPSU obkom second secretary, P. I. Shalafyev, chairman of the rayon Selkhozkhimiya Association, G. Ya. Glazacheva, party bureau secretary of Mobile Construction column No 7, and

Candidate of Economic Sciences V. G. Baryshnikov, general director of the Vologodskoye Scientific-Production Association, spoke above all of the thrifty utilization of the main resource: the land. The speakers pointed out that in a number of farms cultivation is unsatisfactory and the possibilities of converting to scientific farming systems are still being poorly used. Such systems have now been developed for essentially each rayon farm. In particular, they call for the systematic application of crop rotation systems, only 48 percent of which are being applied in the rayon. Therefore, the most efficient factor in upgrading soil productivity is being used at less than 50 percent of capacity. It is important always to remember, the delegates emphasized, that neglect of even a single element of the scientific system endangers the final success of the entire struggle for the crops and that it could reduce to naught all labor and fund investments.

An exceptionally clear example of this fact was cited at the conference. With an identical amount of chemical and organic fertilizers per hectare of arable land, the average annual grain crop yields exceed 30 quintals per hectare at the Krasnaya Zvezda Sovkhoz, whereas they amount to only 20 quintals at the Prigorodnyy Sovkhoz. What is the reason? It is that cultivation of grain crops at Krasnaya Zvezda takes place during optimal times, thus ensuring their high quality, whereas such elementary requirements are ignored at Prigorodnyy Sovkhoz. The partial approach to the work and the waste of resources, in the course of which fertilizers are applied on one field, the best quality seeds at another and herbicides at a third drastically lowers end production results.

The rayon has converted virtually completely to the use of zoned northern grain crop strains. All such strains have a short vegetation period and yield high crops. However, a great deal of grain and other produce fail to be harvested by the rayon farms because of major faults in the production of such high yielding seeds. For example, whereas during the 10th Five-Year Plan treated seeds were used on 70 percent of the areas in grain crops, no more than 64 percent of such areas were used during the 11th Five-Year Plan. The situation with potato seeds is even worse. In 1985 the share of zoned potato strains in the farms did not exceed 57 percent. This is one of the main reasons for the sharp drop in potato yields during the poor season of 1985 and also for the underfulfillment of the state purchasing plan by the rayon. Yet, we are speaking of a suburban area!

The rayon managers were blamed at the conference for lagging in flax growing. The plan for flax purchases has not been fulfilled in recent years and in the 5-year period as a whole. The example of Belovskiy Sovkhoz, which was only recently lagging but which has now fulfilled its plan for the sale of flax to the state 150 percent, makes rather unconvincing references to difficulties existing in the cultivation of this crop, although such difficulties do exist. The main reason for the lagging in this sector is that the overwhelming majority of flax growing farms are not properly fighting the weeds, for which reason harvesting machines are not operating at full capacity and the quality of the flax remains low. As a result, the growing of this highly profitable crop has become a losing sector in many farms.

Major omissions exist in the application of other elements of a scientific farming system as well. Thus, in recent years the rayon has failed to fulfill its plan for the application of organic fertilizer, the comprehensive cultivation of fallow land and plowing. In Vologodskiy Rayon a hectare of reclaimed land yields substantial crop increases: 7 quintals in grain crops and 9 quintals in perennial grass hay per hectare. However, the drained land is not always used as planned.

Animal husbandry, dairy farming above all, holds a leading position in the rayon's agriculture. Yet, the participants at the conference noted, scientific and technical progress has so far insufficiently affected this sector, although intensive factors have begun to operate here as well although not so energetically as one would wish.

During the 12th Five-Year Plan particular emphasis should be put on upgrading the breeding qualities of the milk herd and drastically improving, on the basis of scientific recommendations, the organization of the reproduction of the basic herds. It can no longer be tolerated, the speaker said, that nearly 25 percent of the cows in the rayon have no offspring, that in some farms sterility accounts for as much as 35 percent or more and that work on raising first-rate young replacement cattle has weakened. In this rayon, which has the best cattle-breeding base in the oblast, average annual milk yields of nearly 14 percent of the cows do not exceed 2,500 kilograms.

In discussing means of intensification of the sector, the party members emphasized the need drastically to upgrade the quality of the feed by applying progressive procurement and storing methods. So far no energetic work in this area is taking place in a number of rayon farms. This year only 53 percent of the procured hay and less than half of the haylage and silage may be rated first and second grade. Yet, the substantial feed overexpenditures resulting from the imbalance of nutritional elements is common knowledge. In its resolution, the party conference made it incumbent upon the CPSU raykom, the farm party organizations and the rayon agroindustrial association energetically to undertake the construction of sheds and hangars for hay storage, with active ventilation, and persistently to undertake the growing of root crops, without which stable high milk yields are impossible.

The increased efficiency of animal husbandry is based today to a decisive extent on improving the quality of goods marketed, the elimination of unjustified losses and the strengthening of economy and thrift. As the discussion indicated, the rayon has substantial possibilities in this respect.

#### Improving the Work Style

One of the reasons for the success of the conference is the self-critical nature of the accountability report submitted by the raykom and the sympathetic exigency with which it was discussed. No single rayon party organization manager was ignored in the critical remarks, some of them rather frank, expressed by the delegates.

In my view, the main shortcoming in the work style of the party raykom, buro and secretaries was formulated most profoundly and accurately by M.G. Lobytov,



a party member for almost half a century. A veteran of the kolkhoz system and wise leader of the cooperative, who has headed this noted farm for more than 30 consecutive years, softly, as though apologizing for his bluntness, Mikhail Grigoryevich reproached the party raykom for occasionally assuming extraneous economic management functions, thus taking over the functions of the rayon agroindustrial association and farm managers and specialists. Such practices lower their role, weaken the people's feeling of responsibility for assignments, paralyze the initiative of the workers and trigger feelings of dependency among some managers.

"The CPSU raykom," M.G. Lobytov said, in a statement welcomed by the conference delegates, "must decisively reorganize its work style in order to become to the fullest extent a political management body...."

The party members who spoke at the conference indicated that to become an actual political management body means to formulate a political line based on the fundamental party documents and in accordance with local conditions, and skillfully to select and properly place cadres who could implement it. To become a real such body means profoundly to study the work of the primary party organizations, the Komsomol, the trade unions and soviets and comprehensively to contribute to enhancing their role and responsibility and the growth of their influence in all rayon undertakings. That is something which no one other than the CPSU raykom can do.

The conference convincingly proved that the party forces must be concentrated above all on energizing the subjective or, as we now say, the human factor. In the final account, the success of all our plans depends precisely on the working person, on his attitude toward the project.

The energizing of the human factor is a comprehensive task and many weak spots remain in its solution. For example, the turnover of mechanizer cadres in the rayon remains high. Plans for their training within the vocational training system are not being fulfilled. The percentage of first and second class mechanizers working in the rayon is below the oblast average. A number of farms are short of livestock breeders. Meanwhile, school graduates who come to work at the livestock farms are not always treated with the necessary attention. The speakers at the conference also mentioned that more men should work in milking the cattle. Currently some 50 men are holding such jobs in the rayon.

The primary party organizations must do a great deal to develop stable labor collectives. Managing the construction of housing and other sociocultural projects must be radically improved. Tangible improvements must be made in the work of trade, consumer services, health care, public education and cultural enterprises and establishment. All of this will be specific manifestations of concern for the people. The party members said that today party insistence on solving social problems must be as exigent as for the implementation of production programs.

The delegates also called for decisively upgrading the struggle against violators of labor and production discipline. In the past 9 months working time losses in the rayon have increased whereas in the oblast as a whole they



have declined. The rate of absenteeism per 100 working people remains the highest here compared with other Vologoda rayons. Nor is the nature and degree of activeness of the struggle against drunkenness consistent with the requirement of the times. The party, soviet, law enforcement and economic authorities must make fuller use of their rights in bringing comprehensively order, and asserting a healthy way of life. The labor collectives and cultural institutions play a major role in this area.

The delegates emphasized that the most important conditions for the mobilization of the working people for the successful solution of the problems raised by reality is the further democratization of intraparty life. The accountability and election meetings which took place in the primary party organizations indicated that some party members continue to behave passively and can in no way serve as example to others in life and at work. The delegates mentioned with concern the fact that in a number of leading sectors during the period under accountability the party stratum had become somewhat reduced, that the percentage of party members among sovkhoz workers had declined and that in almost half of all livestock farms no party member could be found. Particular attention was paid to the need to upgrade the organizing role of party meetings. They are quite frequently sluggish, lacking the necessary political spirit; they are distinguished by the looseness and toothlessness of the decisions they make. At the same time, the necessary persistence in the implementation of practical and useful solutions and planned measures is not always displayed; this frequently applies to the party raykom as well.

Shortly before the conference the oblast party committee buro heard a report submitted by the raykom on the implementation of the CPSU Central Committee decree on further improving the party's leadership of the Komsomol. The party obkom noted in its resolution essential shortcomings in this work which must be eliminated by the raykom, which must also sharply improve its guidance of the Komsomol and rely more daringly on young people in resolving the rayon's problems, trusting them more and decisively promoting young people to responsible positions.

Milkmaid I. N. Serkova, from the Molochnoye Order of the Red Labor Banner State Breeding plant and training farm, raised in her speech an exceptionally important problem of work with young people. She drew the attention of the participants in the conference to the fact that the entire training of young cadres for the national economy in secondary schools, at the SPTU [Agricultural Vocational Training School] and the Dairy Institute is based on morally and physically obsolete equipment and antiquated facilities. Students at the Vologoda Dairy Institute bitterly joke that the farms of the Molochnoye State Breeding Plant, whose mechanization facilities are on the level of the 1950s, look more like museums of the history of agricultural equipment than modern VUZ training farms. It is difficult under such circumstances to train knowledgeable agricultural specialists! Yet this does not apply exclusively to the future of dairy institute students. It is the quality of training an entire young generation for work, the generation which will replace us. It is a question of tomorrow's active builders of communism who will live and create in the 21st century.

It was natural for the topic of the ideological-political, labor and moral upbringing of young people who must worthily continue the labor and revolutionary traditions of previous generations, to become one of the main topics in the work of the conference. Raised in the accountability report, it was further developed in the speeches by L. P. Malkova, deputy principal for learning at the Kubenskaya secondary school, G. V. Tsvetkova, chairman of the executive committee of the rayon soviet of people's deputies, A. N. Sidorenko, party committee secretary at the Severnaya Ferma Sovkhoz, and other delegates.

Skillful and well-planned ideological and educational work, the party members emphasized, is one of the most important components in resolving the unusually topical problem of comprehensive energizing of the human factor. It is particularly important under contemporary conditions for the mass forms of this work and various types of large scale measures not to push aside life contacts between party soviet and economic managers and people employed directly in the fields, livestock farms, and repair workshops, and young people in hostels and at home. Awareness of the feelings and expectations of the rural working people and their daily needs, and tireless concern for their satisfaction should be a natural standard of the activities of each party committee and all primary party organizations which must become the actual political nucleus of the labor collective.

Delegates to the conference emphasized that applying new and progressive forms of labor organization and wages in all units of the agroindustrial complex is the most important area of application of the efforts of primary organizations and the CPSU raykom. This applies above all to the collective contract, which has already proven its great advantages in the rayon's farms as well. Thus, the workers at the Bragino livestock farm, Striznevskiy Sovkhoz, converted to the brigade contracting system in 1983. One year later gross milk output increased here by 25 percent and labor productivity by 76 percent. The following year labor productivity rose by yet another 24 percent. For 2 consecutive years the livestock farm has not had any loss of offspring. Milk production costs have dropped by 7 percent. There no longer are violations of labor and production discipline. Currently all sovkhos farms have converted to the brigade method. The efficiency of this conversion is confirmed by the fact alone that in 1984 and in the first 9 months of this year milk production per cow increased at the farm by 496 kg.

The party members of Mobile Construction Column No 7, whose collective is successfully coping with the 5-year plans and increasing reclamation construction with every passing year, are setting examples of dedicated and high-quality work and responsible attitude toward assignments and high exigency toward themselves and their comrades, worthy of emulation. Many good words were said about this collective at the conference.

Briefly, the rayon has acquired extensive positive experience in its practical work. Unfortunately, the delegates said, such experience is being disseminated sluggishly. In this connection, the 27th rayon party conference made it incumbent upon the party committees to increase their requirement that economic managers apply progressive technologies and most advanced forms of organization of labor and production and in educating the people.

"Work with cadres is a crucial problem for the rural raykom," M.S. Gorbachev said in Tselinograd. "The kolkhoz and sovkhoz managers are the truly gold stock of our cadres. The prestige of the difficult work of chairmen and directors must be highly rated and enhanced, so that a stable body of economic management cadres be established and strengthened in each oblast, kray and republic."

Although the rayon party committee was not free from errors in cadre selection and placement during the period under accountability, and although many of the comrades promoted to leading positions were unable to pass the test of practical work, nevertheless, as was pointed out at the conference, the majority of those to whom the party raykom had entrusted the leadership of responsible sectors are implementing their party duty conscientiously and honestly, working zealously and with total dedication, initiative and daring. The delegates spoke with a feeling of deep involvement of the need to give farm managers scope for creative searches and socialist initiative.

My visit to the farms of Vologodskiy rayon and participation in the work of the accountability and election conference led to a noteworthy conclusion, which is that during the 11th Five-Year Plan farms, whose managers did not remain idle but eagerly gravitated toward the new and did not stop learning, had made significant progress. O. N. Potekhin, conference delegate and director of the already mentioned Krasnaya Zvezda Sovkhoz, a graduate of the agricultural mechanization department of the Dairy Institute, completed by correspondence his training at the Higher Party School. As member of the party raykom buro and school for scientific communism propagandist, he is engaged in extensive educational work in the collective and directs to such work all farm specialists and managers. The "labor honor code," by which the sovkhoz working people try to live, was drafted on the initiative and direct participation of its director. The great deal of hard farm work does not prevent Potekhin regularly to hold ideological planning sessions at which subunit managers report on the course of educational work in their collectives. Matching the director is T. A. Shishova, the sovkhoz's party committee secretary, who started work at the farm after graduating from secondary special school. Here, at the sovkhoz, she enrolled by correspondence in the economic department of the Dairy Institute and completed her studies successfully.

A number of other managers and party leaders in progressive farms and rayon enterprises worked to improve themselves with equal persistence. These are people who have undergone worker training, the school of basic work, who know all fine points of the production process down to petty details, who have mastered the knowledge provided by contemporary science and fear no difficulties. They are carrying out, calmly and confidently, their difficult yet so greatly needed work of production organizers and educators and managers of labor collectives.

The party conference made it incumbent upon the CPSU raykom to continue to pursue cadre policy guided precisely and strictly by the Leninist principles of cadre selection, based on their practical, political and moral qualities, and persistently to promote cadre upbringing and training, so that they may always be on the level of current requirements.

After discussing the draft new edition of the party program and changes in CPSU bylaws, the conference approved these most important party theoretical and political documents and instructed the new raykom membership to ensure their further and more detailed and thorough study and discussion in party organizations and labor collectives and to organize the thorough record keeping and summation of all remarks and suggestions submitted by party and nonparty members.

During the period under consideration the Vologoda rural rayon made substantial progress in the development of the agrarian economy and all enterprises within the agroindustrial complex. However, the enumeration of successes was pushed far into the background in the course of the work of the conference, which was entirely consistent with the requirements of the times calling for a critical analysis of the situation in the rayon and the scrupulous inventory taking of unutilized reserves. The rayon party members and working people have a great deal of work to do, including efforts related to perfecting management and the cost accounting mechanism within the agroindustrial complex. For that reason the rayon party conference focused its main attention on unresolved problems. Raykom bureau members and secretaries were criticized sharply and exactly. However, they were unanimously reelected to the party committee, thus giving them a mandate to manage all projects expected by the party members and all rayon working people.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/5

FROM MICROCOSMOS TO COSMOS

AU281748 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 85 (signed to press 28 Nov 85)  
p 74

[Article by Academician V. Goldanskiy]

[Text] The army of Soviet scientists, nearly 1.5 million strong, has received with deep satisfaction and pride received the fact that in the draft new edition of the CPSU Program an important place has been assigned to science.

In the chapter dealing with the party's economic strategy, the first subchapter is dedicated to the acceleration of scientific-technical progress as the main lever to raise the effectiveness of production. In this way the party line fixed at the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and at the June conference on issues concerning the acceleration of scientific and technical progress has been extended for many years and decades to come.

A special subchapter has also been dedicated to the party's policy in the field of science, whereupon it has emphasized the importance of ensuring a priority development for basic, fundamental research.

In the previous edition of the CPSU Program, this paragraph listed a long series of concrete directions in the development of theoretical and applied research, and this closely bound the paragraph to the circumstances prevailing at the moment. For this reason one can only welcome the fact that, in the new edition of the program, this list has been omitted.

At the same time it seems to be advisable to emphasize the leading role of Marxist-Leninist methodology in the decisive fields of fundamental research, which are of immanent value and which guarantee the increasing pace of scientific and technical progress both in the immediate and the more remote future, along with the entire path of improving socialism and of the gradual transition to communism.

Having this circumstance in mind, it is suggested that the paragraph dedicated to science be expanded somewhat and that one of its paragraphs be formulated as follows:

"It is important to ensure that basic, fundamental research develops at priority rates. According to Lenin, 'The human mind has discovered many strange things in nature and will discover even more of them, thus increasing its power over nature.' ("Complete Collected Works," vol 18, p 298). The party attaches much importance to research into the fundamental properties of matter, into its structure and changes at all levels -- from the depths of the microcosm to the immense spaces of the universe; it attaches much importance to the study of the basic physical, chemical and biological systems and processes, to mutual enrichment among natural sciences and to the interpretation of the achievements scored by these sciences from the positions of dialectical materialism.

"Determined efforts have to be made to hasten the materialization of scientific ideas in the national economy..."(in continuation, the text of the draft follows).

If the draft new edition of the CPSU Program proclaimed party support for the basic fields of fundamental scientific research, not only it would be a factor inspiring Soviet science, but it would also have a great international importance, because it would be of great moral help to the wide circles of foreign progressive scientists defending the cause of peace and resisting the transformation of science into a tool to aggravate the threat of a war.

Soviet science has already won leading places in a number of fields of present natural sciences. Owing to the constant solicitude of the party, our science will undoubtedly win new peaks both in theoretical research and in combining science with production, and Soviet scientists will be confronted with new great schemes, tasks and accomplishments.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

CSO: 1802/5-F



# POWERFUL MEANS OF ACCELERATING THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOVIET SOCIETY

Au021225 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 85 (signed to press 28 Nov 85)  
pp 74-76

[Article by L. Gordon and E. Klopov, doctors of historical sciences.  
Uppercase passages published in italics]

[Text] The section on "The Social Policy of the Party" plays an important role in substantiating the CPSU's program goals and the ways and means of implementing them. It contains a characterization of CPSU social policy as a powerful means of accelerating the development of Soviet society, and it formulates the basic tasks of this policy. In principle neither the place nor the content of this section give rise to any doubts.

At the same time, we consider that the preamble of this section should be begun with the following definition of the most important, fundamental goal of the party's social policy:

"An important area of CPSU activity, and one which determines the content of CPSU social policy over the entire period of the advance toward communism, is the creation of conditions for gradually overcoming all existing social differences and for asserting the norms and principles of social equality and social justice in the real lives of Soviet people...

Immediately after this the basic tasks of social policy should be enumerated (which in this context take on the nature of a complex rather than simply a collection). Among the basic tasks it would also be possible to name:

"The creation of favorable socioeconomic conditions for the comprehensive development of the personalities of all members of socialist society, and for an increase in the level and an intensification of the effectiveness of their social activeness."

Just after this it should be stated that social policy is a powerful means of accelerating the processes of perfecting socialist society. This will intensify the conviction carried by the given provision.

Finally, in accordance with the content of the given section, it is expedient to call it:

"The Social Policy of the Party and Perfecting the Sphere of Social Relations."

A steady increase in the standard of living of the Soviet people is of enormous significance for implementing the goals and solving the tasks of perfecting the entire system of social relations on the principles of social equality and social justice. For this reason there is no doubt that the problems of increasing the welfare and improving the conditions of work and life of Soviet people is given first place both in the enumeration of the basic tasks of social policy and in the concretization of ways of solving them. It would, however, be desirable for the formulations of individual provisions in the given subsection (as also in some others) to be more precise and more in accordance with the spirit of the program document; for this it is necessary to free them of superfluous detail and from explanations. ("These superfluous words," V. I. Lenin wrote in his remarks on the second draft of the program of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers Party, written by G. V. Plekhanov, "only weaken a quite sufficient and well-delineated expression of a thought" ("Complete Collected Works," vol 6, p 215). Thus, the provision which states that "The party considers that it is a matter of particular social significance to accelerate the solving of the HOUSING PROBLEM, in order that by the year 2000 practically every Soviet family has separate housing--an apartment or an individual house" is quite self-evident, so that the subsequent text, to the end of this paragraph, is superfluous in the party Program (although it would be necessary in plan documents, especially those of a directive nature).

At the same time, the above formulation alone is clearly inadequate for the Program. It seems necessary to supplement it with the following statement of the Communist Party's PRINCIPLED understanding of the aims of its activity in this sphere:

"The CPSU regards as the fundamental aim of its policy in this sphere the provision of each family with comfortable separate housing in which the number of rooms is greater than the number of members of the family."

Certain supplements to the provision on the remuneration of work as the basic source of working people's income and of the rise in their standard of living should also be introduced into the given subsection. Thus, to the formulation on the decisive eradication of unearned income there should be added:

"And deviation from the principle of remuneration for work (both in the direction of increasing the scale of remuneration and in that of reducing it)."

It would be expedient to formulate the following provision either in this same paragraph or in another, specially separated paragraph:

"It is necessary to widen the opportunities of non-working members of society (school children, students, pensioners, and housewives) to work in the sphere of social production, and for workers, employees, and kolkhoz members engaged in the national economy to do additional work, bearing in mind not only the ensuring of a higher standard of living, but also (a) the beneficial influence

of work activity on forming the principles of the socialist way of life, and (b) the more rational utilization of society's labor resources."

The subsection on "Overcoming Class Differences and Forming a Socially Homogeneous Society" convincingly reveals an important natural law of the development of social relations--the drawing closer together of the classes and social groups of socialist society and the establishment of a classless structure of that society--and also ways of implementing this law.

It should perhaps also be clearly stated here that these processes not only level out the social position of individuals, but also help to consolidate the "new forms of social ties between people" (See V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 40, p 316), ties of a collectivist type. In this context it is expedient to develop the provision on labor collectives as the primary cells of society's social structure, and also to formulate a new supplementary provision.

"An increasing role in the formation and consolidation of collectivist social relations is being played by residential communities. The CPSU will contribute in every possible way to developing and deepening direct social ties between Soviet people in their place of residence, to their joint activity in perfecting their environment, and to the creation of favorable conditions for leisure and rest, access to the valuable elements of spiritual culture, participation in sport and physical culture, the education of children and adolescents and informal interpersonal contact."

The importance of this problem is determined by the fact that for the past several decades there has been a process--on the whole progressive--of individualization of everyday life as a precondition for the free and comprehensive development of the personalities of members of socialist society. However, the destruction of the former (frequently archaic) social ties has not been sufficiently compensated for, since the new ties are developing almost exclusively on the basis of people's production or academic activity, while social ties outside the production (academic) collectives are being substantially atomized. On this basis it is possible for tendencies toward individualism as a world outlook and a method of life activity to develop or intensify. Meanwhile the necessity of joint actions by people precisely within the framework of their residential communities is theoretically obvious, and their possibility is revealed in practice. This can be promoted by the development of different forms of self-organization, self-government, and independent activity of people in their place of non-production--that is everyday--life activity, particularly and primarily in those of its lower levels which are not and cannot be covered by the existing system of administrative and economic organization. These systems are extraordinarily unwieldy and do not contribute to the cohesion of people as inhabitants of rayons, districts, and individual houses (in which hundreds of people now live), small villages, and so on. For this reason, the task of turning these communities into socialist collectives united by common conditions of life activity and by common goals, and of changing and perfecting these conditions, is extraordinarily relevant.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

CSO: 1802/5-F

FOR THE PEOPLE'S HEALTH

AU300610 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 85 (signed to press 28 Nov 85)  
p 76

[Article by S. Shenkman, science and health column head of the journal FIZKULTURA I SPORT. Uppercase passage published in italics]

[Text] In the draft new edition of the CPSU Program, highly topical are the lines about the growing importance of physical labor as well as the shaping of comfortable living conditions affect man's fitness. Regular physical exercises are in this respect more useful than anything else.

In practice, the term "physical culture" is being frequently reduced to various kinds of moving activity. However, it is obvious that exercises alone, no matter how salutary they are, are unable to ensure good health and physical fitness. Physical culture is a complex of natural means of influence called upon to ensure good and reliable health. This complex implies the combination of active movement, tempering, rational eating, working and recreation conditions, and the observance of rules to keep the mind and the body sound. Highly important is also the struggle against the harmful habits ruining health: drunkenness and smoking. The effect of these habits on a young organism is particularly grave.

In my opinion, the last point is so important that it should be included in the CPSU Program. Then the paragraph concerning physical culture should read as follows:

"In fomenting public health, in the harmonious development of the personality, and in preparing young people for labor and the defense of the homeland, the importance of *PHYSICAL CULTURE AND SPORTS AND OF THEIR APPLICATION IN DAILY LIVES HAS INCREASED*. The issue is to be organized in such a way as to enable each man from a young age to take care of his physical fitness, to obtain training in the field of hygiene and medical assistance, to live in a sound manner, and to give up harmful habits."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

CS0:1802/5-F

FOR THE BUILDING OF COMMUNISM -- A RELIABLE DEFENSE

AU281815 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 85 (signed to press 28 Nov 85)  
p 77

[Article by Maj Gen V. Samoylenko. Uppercase passage published in boldface]

[Text] Again and again trying to grasp the meaning of the draft new edition of the CPSU Program, each Soviet man experiences enormous pride in our Leninist party. Under its leadership, the Soviet people have achieved great successes in the economy, in the social and the political spheres, in sciences and culture, and have reached new historical lines. New tasks have been put on the agenda for systematic and all-round improvements in socialist society, for fuller and more effective use of its possibilities and advantages, and for our country's further advance toward communism. As it has been emphasized, the CPSU's international policy has been inseparably bound with the party's vital, strategic tasks within the country, and it conveys the only aspiration of the Soviet people--to devote themselves to creative work and to live in peace with all peoples.

The programmatic goal of the CPSU--to create in the name of man and peace--conveys the innermost expectations of our planet's peoples. The CPSU and the Soviet people put on the scale of historical progress not a "Soviet military threat," as the ideologists and politicians of imperialism are trying to assert, but creative work, peace, and friendship among peoples. Our party must take into account the fact that the programmatic goals of improving socialism have to be set in a complex and tense international situation. Imperialism--the culprit of the two world wars--is threatening a third, nuclear missile catastrophe. The U.S. Administration has taken the line of attaining a strategic superiority over the USSR.

Under these conditions, the CPSU is quite rightly regards the defense of the socialist homeland, the consolidation of the country's defense, and the guaranteeing of state security as one of the most important functions of the Soviet state common to all people. Each communist and each Soviet man backs this programmatic thesis of the party with his entire heart and mind. To do their best to keep the country's defense capacity at the appropriate level--this is what the Soviet people regard as their duty before the memory of the millions of those who fell for our homeland's freedom and independence during World War II, as a duty before the present and the future generations.

"The CPSU," the draft says, "will do its best to the effect that the USSR Armed Forces may be at a level ruling out a strategic superiority of the forces of imperialism, that the defense capacity of the Soviet state may improve, and that the combat community among the armies of the fraternal socialist countries may strengthen."

This has been said briefly, but capaciously! Let no one have any doubts: The security of our country and of its allies will be duly guaranteed.

The draft new edition of the CPSU Program more precisely defines the combat potential of the Soviet Armed Forces. It has been described as a strong alloy of the military mastery, the ideological staunchness, the good organization and discipline of the personnel, of their loyalty to the patriotic and internationalist duty, and of their high technical equipment.

The draft has placed the human factor in first place: the military mastery, the ideological staunchness, the good organization and discipline of the personnel, their loyalty to the patriotic and internationalist duty. The aforesaid definition of the military potential reveals the substance of the concept "indestructible moral spirit."

It would be advisable to formulate the description of the combat potential in the final version of the program in the following way: "...A FIRM ALLOY OF THE IDEOLOGICAL STAUNCHNESS, THE GOOD ORGANIZATION AND DISCIPLINE OF THE PERSONNEL, OF THEIR LOYALTY TO THE PATRIOTIC AND INTERNATIONALIST DUTY, OF MILITARY MASTERY, AND OF HIGH TECHNICAL EQUIPMENT."

The formation and consolidation of the Soviet Armed Forces, all their victories won in the civil and the Great Patriotic Wars, and their indestructible power under the present conditions have become possible owing to the CPSU's leadership. Policy in the field of the country's defense and security and the Soviet military doctrine, aimed at defense and security and the Soviet military doctrine, aimed at defense against an attack from outside are being worked out and materialized under the party's leadership. The draft points out that the CPSU considers it necessary to continue to consolidate its organizing and guiding influence on the life and activity of the Armed Forces, to boost the principle of a combined command, to increase the role and influence of political organs and party organizations in the army and the navy, and to foster the intimate link between the army and the people.

The communists of the Armed Forces will do their best to strictly implement this programmatic thesis.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

CSO:1802/5-F



MATERIAL BASIS FOR RALLYING THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

AU281825 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 85 (signed to press 28 Nov 85)  
p 78

[Article by Prof. G. Kharakhashyan, CPSU member since 1932, doctor of economic sciences. Uppercase word published in italics]

[Text] The draft new edition of the CPSU Program offers the characteristics of the worldwide system of socialism and of its role as a decisive factor in the present social development. However, in the first chapter of the third part of the draft there is a thesis which, in our opinion, needs a more exact definition. "In the field of mutual economic relations," the draft says, "the CPSU advocates the further deepening of socialist economic integration as the material basis of rallying the countries of socialism." What arouses a doubt here is not the evaluation of the enormous role and importance of socialist economic integration as a major factor of rallying the socialist countries. This evaluation is indisputable. But is socialist economic integration alone the material basis of this rallying?

Socialist economic integration represents a system of international economic (i.e. production) relations corresponding to the present stage of developing the community of the socialist countries. In this sense integration, as any other sphere of economic relation, is a form of developing productive forces. Its main objective is to purposefully and systematically deepen the internationalization of production and the socialist international division of labor in the shape of the interstate specialization and cooperation of production. In this way, it is not socialist economic integration alone that provides the material basis of rallying CEMA member-countries, but it is called upon to strengthen this material basis, using for this purpose all forms of their economic cooperation. In our opinion, it would be more accurate to render the quoted excerpt from the draft new edition of the CPSU Program in the following version: "In the field of mutual economic relations, the CPSU advocates the further deepening of socialist economic integration, called upon to foment by all means the socialist international division of labor and the specialization and cooperation of production as the material basis of rallying the countries of socialism." Such a more precise definition is the more expedient as the draft new edition of the CPSU Program does not say anything about the role and importance of the socialist division of labor.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985  
CSO:1802/5-F

# ON CHANGES IN THE CPSU STATUTE

Au20601 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 85 (signed to press 28 Nov 85)  
pp 79-83

[Letters to KOMMUNIST from CPSU members]

[Text] The Draft CPSU Statute, including the proposed changes, which has been published in the press, represents an important event in the life of the party and all Soviet people. I fully approve of these changes, subscribe to them, and vote for them. The changes are good, interesting, and necessary and, what is the main thing, they are very contemporary. At the same time, I wish to make several observations within the framework of discussion.

I propose the following edition of the first paragraph of the preamble: "The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the militant tested vanguard of the workers class, the kolkhoz peasantry, and the people's intelligentsia, uniting on voluntary principles the most conscious segment of the Soviet people."

In my opinion, this edition of the paragraph more precisely defines the party's class character.

In Paragraph No 2, Point D, I propose to replace the words "expand his political and cultural horizons" with "systematically raise his ideological level." Furthermore, the need for every communist to "conduct an active and aggressive propaganda of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism" and to "persistently conduct counterpropaganda work in all sectors of his activity" should also be pointed out.

The following new points could be incorporated in paragraph No 2:

"M) It is the duty of every party leader and every member of an elective party organ, regardless of the post held, to systematically conduct the ideological-educational and propaganda work directly in labor collectives and thereby to make his contribution to the production of the real product of labor.

"N) It is the duty of party members to promote the improvement of the environment and the preservation and development of our country's natural resources."

I propose to supplement Paragraph No 9 with two additional provisions:

"A) The presence in the CPSU ranks of the persons who have been proved guilty of squandering the state funds, embezzling state funds, eyewash, machinations or swindling, bribe taking or bribe giving, drunkenness, extortions and thefts, moral depravity, favoritism, or providing unobjective recommendations for admissions to the CPSU, actions that are incompatible with the title of a party member, is impermissible."

"B) For failures to fulfill the statutory demands the party member or candidate member is called to account, involving discussion in his primary party organization and the imposition of a penalty. The discussion about a communist's misdemeanor is held in his presence and, only in exceptional cases, in his absence. The highest degree of party penalty is the expulsion from the party without any right to readmission."

Considering the great importance of the quality of composition of CPSU membership, it is advisable to somewhat widen--as compared with the draft under discussion--the demands concerning admissions to the party. Paragraph No 14 could be supplemented for this purpose with the following: "Those being admitted as candidate party members will be examined on the 2-year program of the University of Marxism-Leninism."

"The status of candidate member is established for a period of 2 years."

It seems that it would be useful to essentially supplement Paragraph No 15 by incorporating in it the following: "Those being admitted as CPSU candidate members must present recommendations by five CPSU members who have been members not less than 10 years and who have known the recommended candidate through joint production and social work not less than 2 years."

"The recommending members are personally responsible before the party (and not before the party organization involved) for the objectivity of their recommendations. Penalty measures, including expulsion from the party, may be imposed on the recommending members for misdemeanor by the candidate recommended by them."

I propose an amended edition of two provisions concerning the party candidate members: a) "Admissions of CPSU candidate members are made **ONLY** [preceding word published in boldface] at general open meetings and decisions on admissions are adopted by secret vote of communists;" b) "Young people up to and including the age of 28 years are admitted to the party only through Komsomol."

I propose to replace the third paragraph in Paragraph 24 with the following: "In the election of party buros (committees) as well as in appointments of responsible workers of the party apparatus, provisions will be made for a systematic one-third renewal of their composition."

"Every communist may be elected to a party position in a given party organization or party organ no more than for two successive terms and, in

individual cases, for three successive terms on the basis of agreement with the higher party organ."

It would be desirable to supplement Paragraph No 27 with the following additional provision:

"The CPSU calls strictly to account both the party organs and their leaders for lack of principled attitude or for failure to adopt timely decisions on the questions within their range of authority, and the calling to account may include dissolving the party organ or a new election of the party organ before the expiration of its term and the dismissal of the leader from his position."

Signed: Professor N. Pushkarev, CPSU member since 1968, doctor of economic sciences. Moscow.

The changes in the CPSU Statute must further: 1) the democratization of internal party relations, the increase of possibilities for more skilled and effective criticism, and the ensuring of conditions for the election of more worthy candidates to party organs; 2) the reduction of the party apparatus, the reduction in the number of meetings, sessions, and other events which are becoming more and more numerous as a result of the formation of workshop party organizations and committees, and the simplification of the election balloting procedure.

It seems advisable to change somewhat and supplement the text of Paragraph No 24 of the Draft. The first indented paragraph should state: "The elections of party organs may be held by open or closed ballot at the discretion of communists themselves." And the third indented paragraph should state: "At every election the composition of raykoms and obkoms must be renewed by one-third and that of party buros and party committees by one-quarter. Raykom and obkom secretaries may be elected in the same organization no more than for three consecutive terms and secretaries of party bureaus and party committees no more than for four successive terms."

In my opinion, Paragraph No 52 should also be more precise. Therefore I propose that it should include the following: "The primary organizations are formed--as a rule--at the working places of communists. In the event that in an enterprise there are fewer than 15 communists, a party group is formed which is part of the primary party organization of the production association concerned or of the territorial (village, zone, or internal rayon) primary organization."

Signed: R. Schmidt, CPSU member since 1964, chairman of the imeni S. Ordzhonikidze Kolkhoz. Razumovka Village, Zaporozhye Oblast.

The first sentence of Paragraph No 24 should read: "The elections of party organs are held by secret ballot." In Paragraph No 25, the words "closed (secret)" should be excised and replaced with "open." We communists hold the same views. Why then hide our opinions and state them anonymously and secretly and not before our comrades in the workshop or the primary party organization, especially at the rayon, city, oblast, or kray party conferences and the party congresses of the union republics and the CPSU Congress?

In formulating the demand concerning the party membership it is necessary to proceed from the tasks, from life and, what is the main thing, to take account of the fundamental demands of the Party Statute as stipulated in Paragraph No 4 which precisely establishes that recommendations for admissions to the party may be made by CPSU members who have been members at least 5 years.

Of what kind of an authority of a party leader can we speak in a given case if the secretary of a workshop or primary party organization or the secretary of an okrug committee or of a raykom or gorkom or the chief of the political department of a military formation do not have the right to make recommendations for admissions to the party?

It is therefore urgently necessary to establish unified requirements for all leading party workers, elected or assigned to these positions, that is, a 5-year standing as party members.

In Paragraph No 72 one's attention is drawn to the phrase "on becoming a candidate of the party," which is not quite legible. It is known that the joining fees are paid by a candidate party member only once in his life. Therefore the text of Paragraph No 72 of the CPSU Statute could read: "Joining fees amounting to 2 percent of the monthly income are paid."

Signed: Major (retired) V. Turik, CPSU member since 1943, party organizer. Leningrad.

Our party organization includes six workshop organizations and has 115 CPSU members. The organization's structure corresponds to the production organization. All six subdivisions are located along the main oil pipeline at distances of 15 to 120 kilometers from the city. It is quite difficult for the communists to come to the place of the meeting. They have to use railway and automobile transport and, at times, also helicopter transport. For this reason the meetings are stretched over periods of 3 days. But because the transport of oil is a continuous process, the question arises for some of the communists of being released from work regardless of whether the days involved fall of Saturday or Sunday.

Proceeding from the aforementioned, I propose that the edition of Paragraph No 56 of the CPSU Statute be changed in the following way:

"As a rule, at large enterprises and institutions that have more than 300 party members and candidate members as well as in organizations with territorially dispersed subdivisions and continuous production processes which have more than 85 party members and candidate members, party committees are formed and the workshop party organizations of these enterprises or institutions are granted the rights of primary party organizations."

I also propose that Paragraph No 54 be changed and that it states: "General party meetings in these organizations are to be held according to need at times determined by the party committee or at the request of several workshop organizations."

Signed: Kh. Muzipov, secretary of the party bureau of the Nefteyugansk oil pipeline administration. Nefteyugansk, Tyumen Oblast.

The violations of the norms of party ethics by officials of the party and the state apparatus become especially intolerable in view of the growing leading role of the party in building communism. The absence of strict control, exactingness toward communists, or effective party criticism in this or that party organization can lead and does lead to moral degradation of the individual workers of the party and the state apparatus.

It would be advisable to work out a complex of measures to make the struggle against violation of the norms of party ethics more effective and especially to intensify the responsibility for favoritism. In my opinion, the fact that the individuals committing such misdemeanors get away with it unpunished is one of the reasons for the spreading of these phenomena.

It is obvious that some additional changes should be introduced in the CPSU Statute and, in particular, in Paragraph No 1, point E, the words "to observe the norms of communist morality" should be followed by additional words "and party ethics."

An additional section XI entitled "Incentives and penalty measures" should also be incorporated in the Statute and it should include Paragraph Nos 8-12. Furthermore, this section should also stress the need to intensify penalty measures for favoritism, define favoritism, and also call attention to the need to intensify the struggle against personal immodesty, communist arrogance, money grabbing, and striving for enrichments.

Signed: Senior Lecturer V. Munkoyev, CPSU member, candidate of historical sciences. Ulan Ude.

I wish to share my preCongress thoughts and, in particular, deal with the question of the duration of terms of work of a communist in the position of secretary of the primary party organization. This is not a new question. It is well-known that the 23rd Party Congress repealed the earlier decision which had determined that secretaries of the primary party organizations could not be elected for more than two successive convocation terms.

I do not favor a simple return to that position. However, in one way or another, the question of replaceability must be given its solution in the Statute. The Party can only benefit from the practice of replaceability. As we know, party work represents a recognition. It is necessary to wholeheartedly believe in the party's cause, in the people and to love the people, to be just and consistent, not to come into conflict with common sense, that is, to worthily represent the party that represents the mind, the honor, and the conscience of the era. The level of the party work and its success depend on who leads it. Formalism in party work is failure in the task. If the secretary of a primary party organization corresponds to the demands of the time and situation and, in other words, he is a figure of the Leninist type, then, as we say, a "great ship will have a great voyage." Such persons of natural gifts are valuable, the party needs them, and they must be advanced further to more responsible work. But what is the use of



having a secretary who is a faceless figure and has no authority among communists? He is dead weight! However, experience shows that some administrators love such faceless ("what can I do for you?") individuals and are doing everything to ensure that they retain their positions (with them things are quiet!). The matter is simple. As a rule the leader is a member of the party buro and his word carries great weight in considerations of candidates for the position of secretary.

I am in favor of healthy relations between the secretary and the administration but it is necessary to elect those who will not start to be apple polishers but will give priority in their actions to the party's directives and the general state interests. Competent people must be found who are capable of working in new ways and who are not afraid of losing a "warm place" for the sake of the triumph of the common cause. It is only under this condition that we can count on success in the cadre policy.

Signed: A. Zaytsev, CPSU member since 1960, construction engineer. Kamensk-Shakhtinskiy, Rostov Oblast.

Our press now carries many articles and reports unmasking abuses by leading officials. The secretaries of primary party organizations who either have adopted a tolerant attitude toward these individuals and have closed their eyes to their abuses, or (what is even worse), have been their accomplices and have protected the offenders, thereby abusing the great authority of the party, are usually called to account together with the offenders. And the rank-and-file communists often adopt a passive and indifferent attitude toward the scandalous practices taking place in their collectives. The trouble is that some secretaries of primary party organizations are picked (there is no other word for this) from among the individuals who are personally devoted to the leaders, who are obligated to them in one respect or another, and who are ready to close their eyes to the abuses of the administration.

And why not introduce an election system for secretaries of primary party organizations which will enable either all or a majority of the communists, members of a given organization, to express their will by voting? Nothing new has to be invented to work out such a system, such a mechanism. It is only necessary to introduce into the practice of party accountability and election conferences the nomination of several candidates for the position of secretary and then conduct the voting for the individual candidates by secret ballot. Whoever receives the largest number of votes is considered elected in this case. The fact is that this would not be contrary to the Leninist ideas and principles on the rights and obligations of party members, and the statutory provisions but, on the contrary, it seems to me, it would provide an enormous stimulus to the development of the internal party democracy and to greater initiative and responsibility of communists before the party and the country.

Signed: V. Novikov, CPSU member since 1941, pensioner by merit. Alma-Ata.

The party's concern for strengthening the workers' core is completely understandable. However, I am deeply convinced that the existing system of regulating the social composition of party ranks needs to be improved. The main shortcoming in this connection is in the fact that the ordinary

engineering and technical workers (designers, adjusters, technologists, and the like) in the scientific research, designing, and other similar organizations, among whom there are many individuals who are wholeheartedly devoted to our political ideals and are honest and principled persons, are left outside the party.

I do not speak without grounds. In the department where I have worked as the chief engineer for the last 20 years and have headed the party group for the last 15 years, only two girls, laboratory assistants, have been admitted to the party and they have been admitted because they have passed the work "scale." Of course, the two girls fully deserve this great honor, but why do we not admit to the party their colleagues, technicians and engineers, whose qualities are in no way worse than those of the two girls?

I am absolutely convinced that the limitations concerning the admissions to the party of ordinary engineering and technical workers directly engaged in the sphere of material production, of physicians, lecturers, and the like, should be abolished.

And the recommendation by the labor collective in which the candidate concerned has worked, for instance, at least 5 years will guarantee that no rascals will manage to make their way into the party.

Signed: V. Butyrin, CPSU member since 1955, engineer-designer, Kharkov.

In November 1984 we held our party accountability and election conference at which we elected the secretary of the party organization and his deputy (our primary party organization has 15 members). A comrade who had been admitted to the party ranks only 2 months earlier was elected deputy secretary. I voted against him because, according to the CPSU Statute, the party membership standing of at least 1 year is mandatory for secretaries of primary and workshop party organizations. But the statute says nothing about deputy secretaries. Does this mean then that even a candidate party member may be elected to that position? I think that this represents a flaw in the CPSU Statute. Paragraph No 55 must be made clearer in the new edition of the Statute.

Signed: I. Veletskiy, CPSU member since 1927, pensioner. Simferopol.

A party member has the right to demand an answer from any party authority on the substance of his address to it. It would be only just if the CPSU Statute made it incumbent upon all levels of party authority to answer in writing any addresses to them from party members. Fulfilling his statutory obligation to report to party organs any actions that are harmful to the party and the state, a party member should not face the dilemma: to write or not to write to the party authority, risking causing displeasure or irritation. He must feel confident that, in the event that he is right, he will always receive the firm and resolute support of the party committee.

Signed: I. Marchenko, CPSU member since 1953, engineer-technologist. Poltava.

Nothing is directly said in the existing CPSU Statute about the primary party organization whose members are all or nearly all communist pensioners. However, the activities of these organizations, formed within housing administrations (housing operation management, housing operation offices), are distinguished by significant specific characteristics. The pensioners who are mainly members of these party organizations (consisting often of 100 to 200 members) are usually disabled for work. At least half of them are altogether incapable of fulfilling party and social assignments. In such organizations it is not easy even to pick out a sufficient number of communists for the party buro who are able to work and are suitable for that assignment.

At the same time, experience has shown that the degree of party influence on activities of the housing administration (housing operation management, housing operation office) collective and on the population served by it depends to a considerable extent on the initiative and militancy of the social organizations operating there. The role of the secretary of the party is especially important and responsible. However, I repeat, in most cases it is difficult to find among communist pensioners a suitable candidate for that position.

It seems to me that it would be advisable if, on recommendation by the raykom concerned, experienced communists working in enterprises, scientific research institutes, and other institutions located in the same rayon as the housing administration concerned were nominated for the positions of secretaries of these party buros. And in this connection--all conditions being equal--priority should be given to the communists residing in the territory of the given housing administration.

One way or another, it seems to me that the CPSU Statute should reflect the specific characteristics of the party organizations whose members are mainly non-working pensioners.

Signed: G. Voronin, CPSU member since 1944, pensioner. Moscow.

I wish to submit the following proposal for consideration by a wide circle of communists. The rights of all working people and labor collectives in the society's political, social, and economic life are expanding more and more in the process of perfecting developed socialism. In this connection I propose to supplement Paragraph No 4 of the CPSU Statute with the following provision: "In joining the party, members of labor collectives may turn for recommendation for admission to the CPSU membership (candidate membership) directly to their labor collective if they have worked in it at least 3 years and are not Komsomol members."

The right to make recommendations could be granted to the labor collectives of at least 50 workers.

Signed V. Vlasov, CPSU member since 1979. Murmansk Oblast.

It was stressed at the 21st CPSU Congress: "There can be no indulgence toward anyone when the honor and authority of our party and the purity of its ranks are involved!" It is difficult to consciously accept that an individual

holding the party membership card is, let us say, a bureaucrat, formalist, grabber.... And, yet, facts show that unfortunately there are still such people. It is not simple to recognize at first glance who is who. The individual who has no place in the party is often courteous, behaves nicely, and does not always snarl at everyone. I think that to prevent various types of rascals from making their way into the CPSU ranks, the party Statute should make a stronger provision for greater responsibility of the recommending body or individual for the recommended candidate and for the positive characteristic given the candidate.

Signed: Lieutenant Colonel (retired) G. Salamov, CPSU member since 1928. Kislovodsk.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

CSO: 1802/5-F

## EXAMINING THE PROBLEMS OF MEASURING LABOR PRODUCTIVITY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 85 (signed to press 28 Nov 85) pp 84-95

[Article by Doctor of Economic Sciences L. Zhukov and Candidate of Economic Sciences Yu. Perevoshchikov, honored leader in science and technology of the Udmurt ASSR]

[Text] The draft of the new edition of the CPSU program notes that quality indicators which reflect, in particular, the growth of labor productivity on the basis of scientific and technical achievements, must assume a leading position in the plans. The implementation of this stipulation calls for improving the very methods used in measuring labor productivity. For the time being, the long search for new indicators and the already existing value measurements do not allow us substantially to improve the system for planning labor productivity.

A number of Soviet economists, S. G. Strumilin in particular, have noted, on the basis of the Marxist definition of labor productivity and the productive power of labor, that "as we know, labor productivity is measured by the quantity of the product  $p$  in terms of its consumer value, produced per unit working time  $t$ , i.e., as the result of the  $p/t$  fraction. The product of the reverse fraction  $t/p$ , i.e., the amount of labor of average quality materialized per unit of output, is the measure of the value of this product. The time economy  $E$  achieved in both cases can be considered either as a steady drop in production costs and value of products or as a measure of upgrading the productive force of labor, depicting one and the same economic law inherent in socialism to a greater extent than in capitalism. Therefore, labor productivity and the law of economy are economic categories which are so interlinked and inseparable that neither of them can be imagined without the other in the first and second phases of communism. Neither socialism nor communism can be built without economy of time. Therefore, we shall not be able to do at all without measuring productivity and without measuring labor economy, whatever description they may be given, even under total communism" (S. G. Strumilin, "Izbr. Proizv." [Selected Works], in 5 volumes. vol 3. Nauka, Moscow, 1964, p 491).

Upgrading labor productivity and economy of time are a constant and mandatory prerequisite for social progress and the main and decisive factor for the systematic improvement of the well-being of all members of society. Both

theory and practice confirm the deep meaning of Marx's prediction that "...economy of time, as well as the systematic breakdown of working time among the various production sectors remains the first economic law on which collective production is based. It becomes a law even at a much higher level" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 46, part I, p 117).

Although we acknowledge the significance of the categories of value, cost and profit in a socialist economy, we should point out that at the present time such value indicators alone cannot characterize to a sufficient extent the national economic efficiency of production processes. Under present day conditions the increased pace of production concentration leads to the fact that within some of our enterprises the need for compensation trade is eliminated. The increased number of associations broadens the range of enterprises which no longer engage in usual commodity relations. Therefore, within a specific area the significance of value indicators declines while that of natural-labor indicators, which characterize enterprise activities more objectively, rises. The need has developed of creating the type of system of criteria in which the planned regulation of labor outlays would assume a fate consistent with social labor--direct working time.

The increased role of the measurement of labor in the Soviet economy, expressed in terms of working time, is related to the fact that in measuring labor productivity and possibilities of its growth, all types of economy are, essentially, possibilities of saving on working time. "Working time, even after the exchange value has been eliminated," Marx wrote, "always remains the structural substance of the wealth and the measure of the costs of creating it" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 26, part III, p 265).

The incomplete development of a number of methodological problems has led to the fact that the assessment of outlays and results of social labor has not been properly developed. Such problems, which have remained unresolved scientifically, cannot be considered resolved in terms of practical work. The absence of a uniform scientific concept for explaining the methodology for measuring labor productivity leads to the growth of empirical studies of economic activities of enterprises and national economic sectors. In this case "situational approaches" assume a dominating significance. We believe that pitting a specific situation against a general trend and specific against general features is entirely unsubstantiated. In pointing out the importance of theoretical developments, V. I. Lenin noted that "...whoever undertakes to resolve individual problems without having resolved the general ones will invariably, at every step, subconsciously, 'encounter' such general problems. Yet, blindly encountering them in each specific case means dooming one's policy to the worst possible confusions and lack of principles" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 15, p 368). This Leninist methodological instruction is of both theoretical and practical significance.

Subsystems which cover individual aspects of labor activities cannot have direct national economic objectives. It is only the practice of consumption and public demand that are able to formulate the deep criterial objectives all such subsystems. The general approach to measuring labor productivity must quantitatively reflect the laws of planning and scientific and technical and social progress, the purposefulness of ecological programs and a system of



subordination in the methods for attaining objectives in terms of both space and time.

Priority must be given to the need decisively to enhance the primacy of the national economic approach. Under contemporary scales of production socialization, global national economic ratios are not a secondary value which combines local standards but the primary, the supreme level in planning hierarchy.

Changes in the criteria used in evaluating the activities of ministries and enterprises should contribute to strengthening the primacy of the national economic approach, i.e., assessing the quality of such activities based on their contribution to achieving high end national economic results. "Any management system," the draft new edition of the CPSU program stipulates, "should be directed toward increasing the contribution of each national economic unit to reaching the end objective--the highest possible satisfaction of the needs of society with the lowest possible outlays of all types of resources. This is an inviolable law of socialist economic management and a basic criterion in assessing the activities of sectors, associations, enterprises and all production cells."

As one of the essential elements in the planning system, labor productivity indicators must define the basic trends of economic development. They must reflect the totality of complex links among units and parts of the single national economic complex. A major manifestation of the systemic approach, such as integrity, is characteristic of these indicators. Another one of their features is their hierarchical nature. Furthermore, the indicator system reveals two combined properties: stability and dynamism. Consolidated indicators play a particular role in the latter.

On the theoretical level, the problem of labor productivity is as extensive and comprehensive as is the practice of its resolution. Establishing a scientifically substantiated and practical acceptable method for computing and planning labor productivity is a major component of this problem. The proper determination of the level and pace of its growth largely determine the quality of planning and its further enhancement and the realistic nature of the plans. A substantiated, stressed yet possible plan stimulates the steady growth of labor productivity.

In resolving methodological problems of measuring labor productivity we must proceed not on the basis of individual examples which reveal the shortcomings of one method or another, for individual examples could always be selected in sufficient number and, in themselves, prove nothing. We must proceed from basic theoretical stipulations, i.e., from the fact that, to begin with, labor productivity means productivity of specific labor, always related to the production of an item with specific consumer qualities. Secondly, we must distinguish between labor productivity at each section of the work (a work section may be a workplace, a shop, enterprise) and labor productivity by sector and for the national economy as a whole. Thirdly, if we approach the problem in terms of measuring the national economic results of labor, we must take into consideration outlays not only of live but also materialized labor and the struggle for the steady growth of labor productivity must be aimed at

economizing on both. Thus formulated, the problem of upgrading labor productivity develops into the more general task of saving working time.

The labor productivity indicator is physical by nature. It is inseparable from the physical-quantitative measurement of output and cannot be structured separately from quantitative measurement of the mass of produced items. "However, the method of planning in terms of tons, pieces, meters and other physical values separated from the consumer value of the commodity has remained, unfortunately, virtually unchanged," academician O. K. Antonov wrote. He further suggested that "in order for an enterprise, converting to the production of a better quality item does not go bankrupt" but continue to operate under normal conditions, the rigid physical units included in the plan assignment must be replaced with flexible units which would combine the categories of quality, quantity and price, thus enabling the collective to attain their optimal correlation profitable to itself and to everyone else.... One of the efforts to find a constructive approach to the solution to this problem is that of the NKhP--national economic indicators--we suggest, the main among which today could be that of gross output and price, both taking quality into consideration. Remembering that the Latin word *qualificare* means to define quality, we could describe the first indicator as "quali-gross" and the second, "quali-price." What is the main feature distinguishing these indicators from current ones? Only the fact that they reflect more completely and more accurately changes in the consumer value of the product, i.e., the usefulness and efficiency of its use in society with changes in design, productivity and integral quality" (O. K. Antonov. "Quality of Output and Quality of Plan Indicators." EKO, No 4, 1974, pp 14-16).

The qualitatively defined product with its specific consumer qualities, created by specific labor and meeting qualitatively defined social requirements, is the actual result of social production. Material goods are a source of satisfaction of the needs of the people. However, it is only part of their useful features which satisfy requirement.

Having considered the consumer qualities of produced goods as directly related to the objective of socialist production, we must resolve the problem of their measurement. The methods used in economic practices of measuring labor productivity in accordance merely with the quantitative aspect of the product lead, as we know, to distorting the level and dynamics of output. In order to eliminate this shortcoming, the volume of output and labor productivity must be recomputed in accordance with the coefficient of usefulness of material goods.

On the basis of O. K. Antonov's suggestion, and taking into consideration contemporary qualimetric accomplishments, the accomplishments of a scientific branch studying and applying methods for the quantitative evaluation of production quality, let us introduce the concept of qualimetric volume of production output. Although the name may be somewhat new, essentially this is the summed up characterization of physical, standard-physical and standard reduced methods for defining the volume of production output in various economic sectors. The qualimetric volume of output is a value computed by multiplying the volume of produced commodities (in terms of pieces, tons, meters, etc.) by the individual indicators of consumer properties (qualities)

per unit of output. We have given the name of qualimetric indicators to the individual quality indicators.

This approach enables us to measure the consumer qualities of heterogenous items within a common range of a superior qualification group. For example, all food products could be converted in terms of kilocalories of heat generating capacity; all types of fuel may be commonly measured in terms of units of regular fuel; crop products may be measured in terms of feed units, printed products in terms of standard printed and accounting-publisher sheets, etc. In a word, we can single out within the common range of consumer qualities and features a basic qualimetric indicator which can quantitatively characterize all items within a given class. Such a qualimetric indicator will be the basic qualifying parameter.

We single out among the infinite number of features and characteristics describing quality only those which are of interest at each specific time from the viewpoint of satisfying personal or public needs. That is precisely why the concept of "production quality" is always related to the degree to which the needs of the individual or society are met. In this connection, the concept of production quality also includes functional indicators which, although not always included in blueprints, technical stipulations or standards, nevertheless characterize quality. Such indicators include reliability, durability, aesthetics and other features characterizing the consumer qualities of items.

Three trends have become apparent currently in the interpretation of the concept of "production quality:" the first is a conventionally identifying quality relating it to one of the main features of the commodity; the second considers quality exclusively from the viewpoint of consistency with a specific blueprint or technical stipulations; the third, the new one, is the one which studies quality from the viewpoint of the set of individual components and, consequently, which includes both the first and the second.

Stages of the "life cycle" of a commodity are known in industrial practice: design, production, distribution and consumption. At all of these stages the commodity directly becomes the object of human influence. Consumer qualities appear in the course of commodity designing and production; they disappear at its consumption stage. However, the usefulness of the item begins to take shape from the very birth of the idea, i.e., during the preplanning stage. The technical assignment for designing an industrial commodity determines the main, the decisive consumer features. A prerequisite for the formulation of such features is found either in already existing commodities along with their socially developed consumer characteristics or the general laws of nature, discovered and formulated by basic science.

Logically any product could be considered from the viewpoint of the specific manifestation of the basic laws of nature, such as that of conservation and transformation of energy and others. Consequently, the basic laws of nature could be considered prerequisites and foundations for the classification of labor products based on their main consumer quality. At that point the system of indicators could be presented as follows:

1. Material carriers: natural and semimanufactured raw materials, such as ores, timber, stone, clay, lime, bricks, rolled metal, cast metal, castings, cement, etc.; the basic qualimetric indicator would be the qualitatively determined mass (qualimass);

2. energy carriers: wood, peat, coal, petroleum, water, radioactive ores, biomass, chemicals, etc.; basic qualimetric indicator: heat generating capacity (calorie);

3. matter and energy transformers: leverage systems, steam engines, generators, turbines, electric motors, internal combustion engines, wind, water, and jet engines, batteries and similar machines, equipment and systems; basic qualimetric indicator: material and energy transforming capacity (watts, kilowatts);

4. matter and energy regulators: water, steam and gas pipes, electric and radio transmission systems, slide valves, valves, connecting and transforming systems, clothing, housing, dams, reservoirs, storage areas, electric and radio elements, etc.; basic qualimetric indicator: handling capacity of matter and energy (qualicubic meter, joule, newton-meter, pascal, calorie, etc.);

5. information carriers, such as alphabets, time computation systems, reference manuals, artistic and specialized publications, paintings, music records, drawings, etc. Basic indicator: amount of information (bit, byte, logon, symbol);

6. information transformers: accounting and writing mechanisms and systems, television systems, radio receivers, computer and analog systems, etc.; basic qualimetric indicator: capacity of transformed information (bit/second, logon/minute, and symbol/minute);

7. information storing devices: bibliography, stocks of scientific and technical information, stocks of algorithms and programs for computing machines and computers, and current and long-term computer "memory;" basic qualimetric indicator: volume of information stored (logon, symbol, term).

Other basic qualimetric indicators could include a combination of those we enumerated. Naturally, a great deal of this breakdown is arguable. The very problem of classification of labor products itself, however, has not been fully resolved and is subject of arguments.

We know that natural production measures currently used are pieces, meters, square and cubic meters, tons, ton-kilometers, sets, and other quantitative measures. However, they do not reflect the nature of the consumer properties (qualities) of output. We submit that a system of quantitative measures be used to express them: qualimetric mass (qualimass), qualimetric quantity (qualipiece), qualimetric length (qualilength), and qualimetric volume (qualivolume). The following could be adopted as qualimetric measurement units: for the qualimetric mass: qualiton (quat), qualikilogram (quakg), qualigram (quag); for qualimetric volume: qualicubic meter (quam3) and its

derivates; for qualimetric length and area: qualimeter (quam), and qualisquare meter (quam<sup>2</sup>).

Such measurements would enable us to compute the volume of commodity output on various levels of the national economic complex not by multiplying physical commodity units by their price but by multiplying the same numbered amount of commodities by the amount of the socially useful consumer effect in its units (the qualimetric indicator).

The development of a system of qualimetric indicators reflecting various characteristics and useful features of items (in industrial and personal consumption) presents the greatest complexity and difficulty. In particular, the method of simple multiplication of the individual values of the quality coefficients expressed through the correlation between the measured values of the quality parameter and the standard value of the same parameter, could be used in the elaboration of such a system of qualimetric indicators (a qualimetric system).

In another case the same value could be determined with the use of the developing theory of the desirability function, which uses the concept of the mean geometric to express the summed-up quality indicator. In this case each specific desirability function may be obtained as a result of tests, statistical studies, expert evaluation methods or through analytical means, presented as charts, or empirical formulas and tables. The summed up qualimetric indicator could be introduced through the application of the regression analysis methods.

The science of qualimetry, which appeared in the 1960s and is tempestuously developing, making use of tremendous practical data and some analytical methods used in commodity studies, price setting and design, and developing its own methodological base, could be used to provide for a number of types of the all-union classification of industrial and agricultural commodities a system of quantitative methods for quality determination, i.e., a system of individual and consolidated qualimetric indicators (quality indicators).

As recommended by qualimetrist G. G. Azgaldov, one of the primary and basic stages in the elaboration of a system of qualimetric indicators for any class (group, subgroup, type) of output is the formulation of a property chart. Whereas in the "life cycle" of output we single out the three basic stages--design, production and consumption--in accordance with this three-stage existence of the product, we could draw up a chart of characteristics and a suitable qualimetric indicator system.

Design is the stage at which an information model of the commodities is created as a description, drawing, instruction and development of production algorithm, in the form of technological documentation. The contemporary development of scientific design principles and methods convincingly proves the possibility at this very stage of formulating quite precise qualimetric indicators for the overwhelming majority of items. The sum total of qualimetric indicators characterizing production quality should be divided into two interrelated subsystems: exploitational qualimetric indicators and production qualimetric indicators. The two subsystems are related through a

functional dependency. Production qualimetric indicators determine the level of usable qualimetric indicators; meanwhile, the exploiting characteristics develop the trend of changes in qualimetric indicators of output.

We developed and practically tested methods for computing qualimetric indicators for the "reducers" class (cylindrical, conical, worm) for the "sports-hunting weapons" class (smooth-bore and threaded hunting weapons and carbines, sports weapons, rifles, carbines and pistols), for the "cutting and measuring tools" class, for cast and rolled steel shaped items, and for public catering enterprises, based on the example of plant and school cafeterias.

For example, if we consider the class of "reductor" items, after their study based on qualimetric indicators reflecting operational characteristics, such as torque at the reductor's outer shaft and the structural and technological complexity expressed in qualipieces of parts, durability, reliability, repair ease and aesthetic appearance, it is possible to compute the planned and actual output of different reducers in single measurement units--qualipieces.

The volume of output of the various types and varieties of sports-hunting weapons could be computed on a combined basis in qualipieces of items, which would take into consideration the muzzle energy, speed of fire, close-grouping of the shots, full operating time, reliability, ease of use, aesthetic appearance and the qualimetric mass of the item, which would include, in addition to the physical volume, the design-technological complexity of arms manufacturing.

The volume of output of cutting instruments, measured in qualipieces, would include not only a physically accountable quantity but also strength of material, complexity of design, service roughness and the technological characteristics of the manufacturing of the tool.

At casting enterprises and shops, the volume of output, expressed in qualitons, would include, in addition to the physical mass of the castings, type of material, complexity of geometric shape, precision of dimensions, technological manufacturing characteristics and the type of serial production.

The production of items in public catering cafeteria systems could be measured in physical number of dishes based on the standard number of calories in the food, the standard complexity of the technology of preparing the dish and the factual organoleptic evaluation of taste qualities.

Experimental assessment of volumes of output in such public production areas indicate the theoretical substantiation and practical expediency of the use of the theory of qualimetry in resolving problems of the physical-labor method of measuring labor productivity.

The method suggested of measuring labor productivity by correlating output in its consumer qualities with present and past labor outlays triggers difficult problems of measuring labor outlays. The scientifically substantiated total assessment of overall labor outlays is an important and difficult problem. The most promising method for its computation is reducing all outlays to live labor outlays, which requires the determination of the quantity of live labor



in terms of equivalent labor spent at previous production stages and materialized in means of production. The Marxist definition of the production power of labor is of essential methodological importance: "Naturally, a production force is always the production force of useful and specific labor and actually determines only the extent of efficiency of purposeful production activities in the course of a given time interval. Consequently, useful labor becomes greater or lesser source of products, directly proportional to its greater or lesser productive force" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 230, p 55). The use of the possibilities of a quantitative manifestation of the increase or decrease of the production force should be considered in the light of Marx's indication that "the productive power of labor is determined by a variety of circumstances which include the average level of skill of the worker, level of development of science and degree of its technological application, the social combination of the production process and the sizes and efficiency of means of production and natural conditions" (Ibid. p 48).

The first part of this definition leads to the conclusion that labor productivity is directly proportional to the productive force of labor, i.e., that in order to compute labor productivity we must know the value of the productive force of labor. This concept can be expressed mathematically as follows:  $P_l = f(P_p)$ , i.e., labor productivity ( $P_l$ ) is a function of the productive power of labor ( $P_p$ ).

The study of the second part of the definition on the basis of the indicators of contemporary socioeconomic statistics lead to the conclusion that the productive power of labor may be quantitatively expressed on the different levels of the national economic complex through the following indicators: level of education and length of practical work of the working people, the machine-labor ratio, energy-labor ratio, electronic-labor ratio, technological labor availability, level of labor organization, production and management.

Since consumer qualities are a material form of the materialized live and past labor, this not only does not exclude but, conversely, confirms the need of assessing labor productivity in accordance with its outlays in both forms. Output at a socialist enterprise must be assessed, in our view, not in terms of the size of the newly created value but the bulk of the output, quantitatively expressed in terms of consumer qualities correlated with outlays of live and past labor.

On the basis of these concepts we have introduced general mathematical dependencies of labor productivity on the productive power of labor.

The practical task is to find quantitative measurements and values of the factors of the productive power of labor and specific values indicating the extent of influence of such factors on the level of labor productivity in various economic sectors and combined units (classes) of output.

In this connection, we conducted studies of the production of reducers, sporting-hunting weapons, tools and work of casting enterprises on the basis of the concepts described, and indicated the possibility of reflecting the Marxist definition of the productive power and productivity of labor in terms

of specific numerical values and the way they can be recorded in the documents of associations (enterprises) and their subdivisions.

The nature of the scientific and technological revolution taking place in the national economy is reflected, on the one hand, in the development of the material and energy foundations of the productive power of labor. On the other, it is characterized as the ever accelerating and growing process of replacing live with materialized labor. It is entirely obvious that the limited possibility of the extensive use of the live labor factor determines objectively the need to upgrade social labor productivity by changing the structure of labor outlays toward the ever growing specific share of materialized labor outlays, reducing the share of live labor outlays while reducing overall labor outlays per qualimetrically defined unit of output.

Let us illustrate this as follows. Let us consider two time periods  $t_0$  and  $t_1$ . Let us mark labor productivity during the  $t_0$  period as  $P_0$  and, respectively as  $P_1$  for the period  $t_1$ . In that case the labor productivity index  $I_p = P_1 : P_0$ . According to the definition of the productive power of labor, it follows that the indices of labor productivity and production power are directly proportional to each other and, consequently, the equation could be presented as follows:

$$I_p = I_v \cdot I_{nu} \cdot I_k \cdot I_m \cdot I_{en} \cdot I_{el} \cdot I_a,$$

in which  $I_v$  is the index of the quantity and quality of labor objects;  $I_{nu}$  is the level of organization;  $I_k$  is the qualification;  $I_m$  is the machine availability;  $I_{en}$  is the energy-labor ratio;  $I_{el}$  is the electronic labor ratio and  $I_a$  is the index of technological availability of labor. This shows that in order to change the labor productivity indicator we must change the indicator of the factors of the productive power of labor.

The labor productivity indicator could be presented as the product of two indicators: the indicator of volume of output and that of live and materialized labor. The problem of measurements of the natural volume of output is resolved through the formulation and application of methods for computing the qualimetric volume of output.

However, another problem arises: computing outlays of live and past labor. It can be resolved with the help of the methods used in computing production costs. In computations of the production costs of an individual commodity and of the total output of an enterprise, association or sector, labor outlays are reflected in the item "wages of basic production workers" and in the corresponding items of shop and overall plant overhead and outlays. Production costs for the other items as a whole reflect outlays of past labor relative to wage outlays.

The concept that the growth of labor productivity reflects a lowering of outlays of live and past labor is expressed quantitatively as in real terms through the lowered cost of output in monetary expression. Changes in the correlation between live and past labor in the materialized labor product affect changes in the correlation between wages and production outlays in the other items of the planned and actual production cost computations.

Consequently, it becomes accurate to measure labor productivity through the correlation between the qualimetric volume of output and its actual cost expressed in rubles.

In our view, it would be expedient to replace production cost with the concept of "production outlays in their monetary expression." Production outlays in material and energy terms would express changes in the factors of the productive power of labor while production outlays in their monetary evaluation would reflect outlays of live and past labor. Labor productivity would characterize the production of output in qualimetric terms per 1 ruble of outlays of live and past labor. The size of labor productivity would change according to the measure of the qualimetric volume of output, such as qualipiece/ruble, qualiton/ruble, qualiset/ruble, etc.

Since in measuring labor productivity it is a question of the mass of output measured in terms of consumer qualities, a comparison among absolute output levels is possible only within the range of a qualimetrically homogenous output. In the case of heterogenous output, by the very nature of the heterogeneity of the basic parameter of consumer properties, such a comparison is impossible. It follows from this that from the basic viewpoint the indicator of labor productivity dynamics in the manufacturing of heterogenous items could be defined by computing the indicators of changes in the qualimetric volumes of homogenous output and corresponding outlays of live and past labor for the period under consideration compared with a base period.

The method suggested here of replacing outlays of live and past labor with production outlays in their monetary expression is merely a compromise between theoretical principle and current practice, resulting from the lack of computation of the national economic labor intensiveness of output and the impossibility at the present stage of computing past labor directly in terms of working time.

The theoretical advantages of the qualimetric variant of the natural-labor method of measuring labor productivity are the following: first, no more than two indicators are used in structuring the labor productivity indicator: quantity of output in its physical-qualimetric expression and quantity of labor outlays per unit of working time; second, the production is measured not on the basis of a given feature inherent in all commodities in general but on the basis of a "weighing" of features either on the basis of the sum total of consumer qualities and qualitatively expressed qualimetric commodity indicator or on the basis of the specific labor intensiveness of class of commodities in their qualimetric computation (for example, for the entire class of cutting instruments) within the range of the social production area for which a labor productivity indicator is computed.

An expanded computation of labor outlays is necessary for the extensive application of the qualimetric variant of the physical-labor method for measuring labor productivity. Furthermore, methods for computing qualimetric indicators must be created, standards drafted and reference data for qualimetric indicators of individual items must be developed for all classes and groups of output.

We have already drafted methodical and standardizing-reference documents to compute qualimetric indicators of standardized cylindrical reducers, and cutting and measuring tools, standardized parts, appliances and dies and clamps. The small experience acquired in the practical use of the qualimetric approach in measuring labor productivity indicates that it is essentially universal and applicable in all economic sectors.

What significance could the qualimetric approach to computing the volumes of production output and labor productivity have in terms of the economy?

Theoretical, above all. It is common knowledge that the gross output in its monetary computation is a mixture of outlays and results.

The criticism of said economic paradox is well-known. However, no practically acceptable suggestions for its elimination exist. In terms of its nature, the monetary measurement is the result of outlays of live and past labor and, consequently, it cannot operate in a planned socialist economic management also as a measurement of the consumer qualities of output.

The qualimetric method enables us to formulate a system of interrelated measures and rates for computing consumer qualities and volumes of output. The monetary measurement in rubles remains the method of the single and adequate measurement of the socially necessary outlays of live and past labor in commodity output, computed in qualimetric measurements.

The practical interpretation of such theoretical premises could open the way to improving technical and economic planning in the following areas:

In long-term planning projections, the production of new commodities (materials, machines, instruments, mechanisms) will be planned on the basis of the scientific definition of the trends in the development of basic consumer qualities, i.e., we shall plan the production of items for which not even design documentation has been drafted as yet. The need for resources in such cases will be determined in the long-range plans through economic substantiation based on a system of norms and standards. The lack of an interrelated system of technical and economic norms and standards based on qualimetric indicators of commodities makes it necessary to structure such a system of norms by determining the need for resources either per million rubles of output or per physical ton of anonymous undifferentiated items. The amounts of the norms themselves are also expressed in rubles per ruble, in tons per million rubles, etc.

The qualimetric approach opens the practical possibility of structuring a scientific system of norms and standards based on qualimetric indicators, which take into consideration consumer qualities, for the class, group, subgroup and individual type of commodities in accordance with the All-Union Classifier of Industrial and Agricultural Commodities.

In 5-year and current planning consideration of available production capacities is of basic significance. According to existing practice, production capacity, conceived as the maximally possible annual (daily, shift) commodity output with the full-capacity utilization of equipment and areas for

multiple production facilities and shops (casting, forge-stamping, welding, rolled-metal shaping, instrumental, experimental, machine assembly, etc.), is computed according to current instructions in physical (ton), labor (norm-hour) and monetary (thousand rubles) values. Since all of them are also outlay indicators, we must try to reduce them. However, development requirements dictate the need to increase production capacities, which, ignoring logic, calls for increased production outlays.

The qualimetric computation of the volumes of commodity output enables us to avoid the negative consequences of the outlay approach in assessing available production capacities and their actual utilization. The methods we have developed for computing the production capacity of some shops engaged in multiple production confirm the more extensive possibilities of the qualimetric method for the planned substantiation of production capacities closely related to the consumer qualities of the produced commodities covering the entire planned variety.

In the cost accounting and current-calendar planning and management in primary units of labor collectives (brigades, sections) we find the same adverse phenomena triggered by the use of outlay criteria in defining volumes of output as we do on the higher levels of the national economic complex.

In multiple production facilities the activities of brigades and sections are rated on the basis of the implementation of the variety plan and the dynamics of development defined through the volume of output expressed in norm/hours, rubles and raw material outlays. Once again we note in the primary unit a trend according to which the worse the condition of labor norming becomes and the higher the volume of norm/hours, the more expensive and more extensively used are raw materials and semifinished goods and the more "efficient" is considered and rewarded the work of collectives.

Contemporary requirements of improving production planning and management proceed from the need to convert from norming outlays of labor, materials, energy and fuel in terms of end production on different levels of organization of the national economy. The qualimetric method enables us to combine various types of commodities within the same class and thus facilitates and, in a number of cases, becomes the only means of finding consolidated computation units for end output on one level or another of the national economic complex.

The practical testing of the methods we suggested in the organization of cost accounting of some brigades and sections, based on qualimetric computation of volumes of output, have convinced us that this approach objectively stimulates the growth rates of output of good quality items and lowers production costs.

In our view, this approach to improving methods for computing the volumes of production output could prove to be fruitful in the formulation of a uniform scientific methodology for measuring labor productivity, from the work place to the national economic complex.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985  
5003  
CSO: 1802/5

## OUR KNOWLEDGE, STRENGTH AND WEAPON

### SPIRIT OF PARTY MINDEDNESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 85 (signed to press 28 Nov 85) pp 96-106

[Article by M. Kozmin, written on the occasion of the 80th anniversary of V. I. Lenin's article "Party Organization and Party Literature"]

[Text] In life the present becomes closely interwoven with the past and the future: the past works for the present and, together, they work for the future. Such intertwining of the present with the past and the future was particularly characteristic of 1985. The 40 anniversary of our great victory over fascism and the 80th anniversary of the first Russian revolution are combined in our memory with a feeling of nation-wide upsurge triggered by the party course of accelerated socioeconomic progress and the preparations throughout the country for the 27th CPSU Congress, at which a new draft of the third CPSU program and its bylaws with its amendments and the Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1986-1990 and the Period Through the Year 2000 will be approved. These most important party and state documents are imbued with a spirit of continuity and creative development of party theory and programmatic stipulations. They also imbue the pre-congress debate on our literature, its achievements and shortcomings and greater closeness to the life of the people and the enhancement of its activeness and effectiveness.

In thinking about literature and assessing the contemporary literary process, again and again we turn to a fundamental party document, such as Lenin's article "Party Organization and Party Literature." Published in November 1905, for the past 80 years it has been the theoretical foundation of the policy of the Communist Party in the field of literature; the principle of party-mindedness, as formulated, is a reliable guideline in the development of our artistic creativity.

The publication of Lenin's article coincided with the highest point of the 1905-1907 revolution. This was no accident. "Strict party-mindedness is the companion and result of highly developed class struggle," V. I. Lenin pointed out ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 12, p 133). It is precisely under the conditions of an open class conflict, when the role of struggling parties increases as never before, that the party of the proletariat, the party of the future which, unlike the bourgeois parties, has



no reason to conceal its objectives, openly proclaims that it raises the principle of party-mindedness and extends it to literature as well. This means that life itself and the logic of the class struggle demand that serving the masses means also serving the people and their most progressive and revolutionary class, the proletariat, so that such service may become part of the nationwide, the all-proletarian and all-party cause.

The gravity with which the question of party-mindedness and non-party-mindedness was raised at the beginning of the revolution is explained by the fact that when the bourgeoisie undertook to overthrow autocracy it seemed to implement, on the surface, national tasks. Under these circumstances, non-party affiliation became a fashionable slogan: non-party democracy, non-party organization and non-party revolutionism. In fact, however, indifference toward the struggle waged by the party meant silent support of bourgeois rule. It became a hypocritically concealed manifestation of affiliation with exploiting parties, for which reason Lenin pointed out that "non-party-mindedness is a bourgeois idea. Party-mindedness is a socialist one" (Op. cit., vol 12, p 138).

Lenin was particularly aware of the tremendous harm which the idea of non-party affiliation or non-party revolutionism brought the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. He considered it the poisoning of the people's consciousness and pointed out the dangerous role which the liberal intelligentsia played in this case: "...the influence of the intelligentsia, which does not directly participate in the exploitation process, and is trained to operate in terms of general statements and concepts related to all kinds of 'good' behests, sometimes promoting its interclass status into a principle of non-class parties and non-class policies on the basis of sincere stupidity, such an influence exerted by the bourgeois intelligentsia on the people is dangerous. It is in this case, and in this case alone that we see the contamination of the broad masses, a contamination which could cause real harm and which requires the stressing of all socialist forces in the struggle against this poison" (op. cit., vol 16, p 40). These lines borrowed from the familiar Leninist article "In Memory of Count Heiden," is a brilliant model of a truly party-oriented passionate publicism. Devastatingly mocking the liberal and democratic ditherers of TOVARISHCH, the non-party newspaper, who were touched by the fact that the counterrevolutionary landowner was an educated and humane person, believing that they had risen above the "party-minded" and reached the "all-human" viewpoint, Lenin convincingly proved that their enthusiasm for such "good" and "proper" gentlemen were expressing not the all-human viewpoint but all-human servility.

The revolutionism of the people, who gain their human dignity in the course of the class struggle against exploiters, or the mentality of the slave, who has reconciled himself to his position, open service to the party or hypocritical manipulation of the concepts of the "all-human," "absolute freedom" and "pure democracy," was the way Lenin formulated the question of party and non-party affiliation, identifying the entire comprehensiveness of the principle of party-mindedness and its all-embracing nature and extending this principle to all realms of social consciousness and social life.

It is this universality of the principle of party-mindedness that bourgeois ideologues are totally unwilling to acknowledge. Eight decades have passed since the publication of Lenin's article "Party Organization and Party Literature," and furious attacks against it have been mounted for 8 decades. One of the most frequent attempts to undermine the significance of the article and, in particular, the principle of party-mindedness formulated by Lenin, is the claim that it was addressed not to writers but to party publicists and has no relevance to artistic literature. In their study of the history of the writing of this article, its content and its significance to our literature and literary criticism, Soviet literary experts have long confirmed the groundlessness of such claims. They have established that although Lenin's article indeed discusses the party press and the need to subordinate it to the party organization, it is also addressed to writers and includes most profound theoretical summations pertaining to most important problems of literature and aesthetics and, above all, to the problems of "art and the party," "art and people," "freedom and the artist's social duty," "art and bourgeois society" and "art and socialism." In general, the principle of party-mindedness is extended in the article to artistic creativity as well, as one of the forms of social consciousness.

This is confirmed by the text of the article itself above all: a direct address to writers, painters and actors, and the stipulation that literary work cannot be identified with other parts of the party cause of the proletariat and that it is least of all subject to mechanical equalization or the rule of the majority over the minority, and the fact that it must be given wide scope for thought and imagination, form and content. Finally, the article ends by providing the image of a new, truly free literature, a literature openly related to the proletariat, imbued with the ideas of socialism and serving the broad toiling masses. Unquestionably, it is a question here not of the party press alone but also of artistic literature. Lenin extends the principle of party-mindedness to art as well. This was immediately realized by both Lenin's supporters and ideological opponents, who proved to be more perspicacious than some contemporary "sovietologists." Reactionary philosophers and publicists immediately took up the defense of "pure art," considering the demand of party-mindedness an attempt against the freedom of the artist and the violation of "eternal values." The Marxist critics took up the defense of Lenin's approach to literature and began to promote the principle of party-mindedness in their articles and speeches. In this connection, A. V. Lunacharskiy's article "Tasks of Social Democratic Artistic Creativity," which was published approximately 1 year after Lenin's article, played a major role. This was a passionate support of Lenin's idea of the party-mindedness of art. "I truly assert," Lunacharskiy wrote, "that social democratic creativity must exist and will exist and that it already has its own tasks." He further stated that the Communist Party is not only a tremendous political but also a cultural force, that it is "not simply a party but a great cultural movement, even greater than previous movements of this kind."

As numerous works and studies have convincingly proved, proclaiming the birth of a new literature, truly free in its service to the people and openly related to the Communist Party, Lenin's article was by no means a party diktat in the field of art. It did not impose upon it any kind of regulations or

canons. Its basic ideas represented a summation of the theory and practice of the class struggle waged by the proletariat and the experience of progressive and democratic literature the world over. A very great meaning is contained in Lenin's idea of the party-mindedness of literature. It includes Marx's theory of the class struggle and the direct involvement of literature in this struggle as well as events, such as the brilliant rebuke given by the German revolutionary poet Herweg to Freiligrat, who supported the "independence" of literature and stated that "the poet stands above the party." As we know, the answer to Freiligrat is in the heartfelt lines of Herweg's poem "The Party:"

Oh my party, who are the proud foundation  
And mother of innumerable brilliant victories!  
How can the poet fail to understand this most sacred word,  
How can he fail to reach greatness.

Naturally, in speaking of the party-mindedness of literature, we must recall the international proletarian anthem, our party anthem "the Internationale," written by Eugene Potier, the French poet-worker. Embodying the militant spirit of the revolutionary proletariat and the idea of proletarian internationalism, for more than one century it has fired the hearts of millions of working people, calling them to the struggle against the exploiting regime and for building a new world. Lenin described Eugene Potier as "one of the greatest propagandist through songs" (op. cit., vol 22, p 274), thus emphasizing the propaganda value of literature standing on the positions of communist party-mindedness.

Finally, let us recall the triumph of the principle of party-mindedness in literature, such as the works of Gorkiy, the great proletarian writer of the period of revolutionary upsurge of 1905-1987 and, above all, his famous novel "Mother." Where is the triumph of party-mindedness found in his novel? In the fact that, for the first time, this outstanding work depicts the revolutionary struggle and the characters of its participants, interpreted from the viewpoint of the revolutionary proletariat. This is a novel of people belonging to the Bolshevik Party. Its main character, Pavel Vlasov, openly says that he is a man of the party, that he is a socialist. The socialist ideal is identified in the relations between Pavel and his comrades and in their thoughts and dreams of the future. It is noteworthy that the artistic embodiment of the socialist ideal in Gorkiy's novel was manifested soon after Lenin had announced the need to depict this ideal to the masses in its entire greatness. This was an imperative of the time, expressed in the call of the leader of the Bolshevik Party and the work of art of the great proletarian writer. However, in our view, the triumph of communist party-mindedness, which found its character embodiment in Gorkiy, does not consist of this alone. It also consists of the fact that in Gorkiy's novel party-mindedness imbues the depiction of all sides of life and is revealed in its universal human significance. We can see how in the course of the revolutionary struggle man develops a character and manifests his true human qualities.

By the end of the 19th Century, in his work "The Economic Content of Populism and Its Criticism in Mr Struve's Book," Lenin pointed out the tremendous universal historical significance of the "awakening of man in fetters" (op.

cit., vol 1, p 403). It was essentially this awakening that Gorkiy depicted in the main character of his novel, in Nilovna, who, from a downtrodden, timid and semi-illiterate woman becomes an active, daring and conscious participant in the most progressive and most revolutionary movement. There are reasons to assume that in working on his novel, Gorkiy closely reread Tolstoy's "Resurrection." The explanation is that, obviously, in the novel "Mother," he intended to provide his own understanding, his own variant of the resurrection of the human soul, proving that it takes place not in the course of an individualistic moral self-advancement but in the process of mass revolutionary struggle. It is thus that communist party-mindedness revealed its universal human nature in the novel. Baptized in the font of the revolution, Nilovna sanctified it with her maternal love and the authority Gorkiy considered supreme--the authority of the mother--as the eternal source of renovation of life on earth.

In speaking of flights of party-mindedness in the revolutionary literature of the past and its triumph in Gorkiy's works, we must bear in mind that it did not come out of thin air but was the development of the trend pointed out by F. Engels as an inseparable feature of truly significant works, inherent in all progressive and democratic literature in the world. However, we must also bear in mind that whereas during the pre-October Revolution period one could speak of party-mindedness of individual writers only, after the October Revolution it became a question of party-mindedness of literature as a whole. The features of this literature and its sociopolitical nature were brilliantly anticipated by Lenin, when he wrote that "this will be a free literature, for it is not greed or career but the idea of socialism and sympathy for the working people that will recruit ever new forces within its ranks. It will be a free literature, for it will serve not the sated heroine and not the 'upper ten thousand,' bored and overfed, but millions and tens of millions of working people who are the flower of the country, its strength and its future. It will be a free literature fructifying the latest word of revolutionary thinking of mankind through the experience and life work of the socialist proletariat, creating a constant interaction between the experience of the task (scientific socialism, which will complete the development of socialism away from its primitive and utopian forms) and the experience of the present (the current struggle of comrade workers)" (op. cit., vol 12, p 104).

Lenin's prediction came true. The new Soviet literature, born of the revolution, began to take shape and develop as a free literature in its service to the people and socialism. Its path was difficult, starting with a fierce battle against ideological opponents, surmounting the skepticism and faithlessness in the possibility of its existence, the difficult mastery of the secrets of artistic creativity and a stubborn search for new forms of depiction, consistent with a new and unparalleled content. It had ups and downs, achievements and errors. The Leninist principle of party-mindedness, however, was the invariable guideline of writers who had adopted the platform of the Soviet system and were creating a new art.

Lenin attentively followed the artistic process of the first post-revolutionary years, skillfully and firmly guiding the party's policy in literature and the arts. He saw the awakening of new forces aspiring to the creation of a new art. He also saw the chaotic ferment in the circles of the

artistic intelligentsia. He saw the fierce ideological struggle and the class struggle behind it. He steadfastly promoted the principle of party-mindedness in literature and art and in all realms of cultural life and cultural construction.

In a conversation, of which we know from Klara Tsetkin's memoirs, Lenin expressed most interesting thoughts on the processes which were then taking place in the cultural life of the young Soviet republic and the role which the Communist Party should play in that area. Saying that the revolution had liberated the artist from the demands of the bourgeois market and had given him the right to create freely, in accordance with his ideal, Lenin pointed out that the communists must systematically guide the artistic process and shape its results. In the course of this talk, he developed his ideas on the national nature of art, already expressed in the article "Party Organization and Party Literature;" "Art belongs to the people. Its deepest roots must be found in the very thick of the broad toiling masses. It must be understood and loved by these masses." On the social efficiency of art he wrote: "It must combine the feelings, thoughts and will of these masses and elevate them." On the aesthetic-educational role of art: "It must awaken and develop in them the artist." On the inadmissibility of rejecting something truly beautiful merely because it is old and the veneration of the new only because it is new: "We find here a great deal of hypocrisy and, naturally, subconscious reverence of artistic fashion dominating in the West....It is beyond me to consider works of expressionism, futurism, cubism and other 'isms' as the highest manifestations of artistic genius" ("Vospominaniya o Vladimire Iliche Lenine" [Recollections About Vladimir Ilich Lenin]. In 5 volumes. Vol 5, Moscow, 1984, pp 12-13). Generally speaking, we can claim with full confidence that closest to Lenin was realistic art.

These Leninist thoughts have been reflected in the numerous speeches and many documents of those times and, above all, in the harsh criticism to which he subjected Proletkult activities. His "Draft Resolution on Proletarian Culture," is the most outstanding embodiment of the party's guidance of cultural construction and the development of literature and art as part of the all-proletarian, national and all-party cause. The concepts formulated in this document became, as we know, the base of the RKP(b) Central Committee resolution on Proletkult, dated 1 December 1920, the content of which is a development of the idea of party-mindedness of art. It was precisely this idea that is embodied in the specific requirement that Proletkult work become one of the structural components of the work of the People's Commissariat of Education. It was precisely from the positions of communist party-mindedness that the resolution subjected to harsh criticism the "independence" of Proletkult and the efforts of socially alien elements who had rushed into it to develop in the workers and, above all, the proletarian youth, bourgeois views in philosophy and stupid and distorted taste in the field of art.

In criticizing Proletkult, both Lenin and the party pointed out that a truly proletarian culture cannot be created and developed independently of the best examples, traditions and results. Therefore, the struggle against Proletkult sectarianism enriched the idea of party-mindedness, giving priority within it to cultural and aesthetic problems alongside organizational-political ones.

The harsh criticism of Proletkult, naturally, did not mean any rejection of proletarian literature and art. On the contrary, some revisionists notwithstanding, who claimed that the proletariat cannot create its own art, the party called for building a "true, genuine proletarian culture." At this point we recall the story told by Serafimovich on his visit to Lenin in February 1920, and his conversation with him.

"Are you writing something?" Lenin asked.

"Hard to write now: a great deal of organizational work remains to be done."

"Ilich frowned.

"Yes, we have a great deal of organizational work now in the country. But you, writers, must involve workers in literature. All efforts must be concentrated on that. One must show sincere pleasure at even the smallest story told by a worker. Are workers publishing their works in your journal?"

"Few, Vladimir Ilich. Obviously, there is a scarcity of knowledge and culture."

"Lenin looked at me through squinched laughing eyes.

"Well, no matter. They will learn to write and we will have an excellent proletarian literature, the first in the world'...

"These words expressed great faith in man, in Russian art, an unextinguishable true faith in and love for the working people."

The struggle for the creation of the "first proletarian literature in the world" presented the party with a number of very important and urgent problems. It required the development of the principle of party-mindedness of literature in terms of the difficult and grave social processes which were taking place in Soviet society during the first half of the 1920s. The Marxist-Leninist interpretation of this stage in the development of our literature was manifested in the new party document of great historical significance: the RKP(b) Central Committee resolution "On Party Policy in the Field of Artistic Literature."

This year marked the 60th anniversary of its adoption. In interpreting the historical significance of this document of essential importance to our literature, we see in it the implementation of the literary course earmarked at the 13th RKP(b) Congress in its resolution "On the Press." We also see that the development of its basic stipulations legitimately led to a most important event in the history of our literature, such as the VKP(b) Central Committee Decree "On the Restructuring of Literary-Artistic Organizations" and the unification of Soviet writers within a single creative association.

The resolution "On Party Policy in the Field of Artistic Literature" provides a clear party analysis of the literary process of the first half of the 1920s and defines the party's tasks in guiding the development of the young Soviet literature. This was preceded by a broad and accurate picture of



sociopolitical life in the young Soviet republic. The uninterrupted class struggle waged in the country where the power was already in the hands of the proletariat, which was gradually reeducating the peasantry, squeezing the bourgeoisie out and ideologically winning over the intelligentsia from it; giving priority to "peaceful-organizational work;" and the country's entering the period of a cultural revolution and unparalleled mass cultural growth, some of which was the growth of a new literature--proletarian and peasant--marked the sociopolitical situation which was reflected, and could not fail to be reflected, by Soviet literature of that period.

The resolution assesses the basic groups of writers--proletarian, peasant and so-called "fellow travelers"--from the positions of Leninist party-mindedness and the viewpoint of socioclass content. The party's attitude toward them is defined: friendly welcome and unquestionable support of peasant writers and their conversion to the track of proletarian ideology without eliminating from their creativity peasant literary-artistic characters. In terms of the fellow travelers, the resolution indicates the need for a tactful and careful approach to them, such as to provide all the necessary conditions for their fastest possible conversion to the side of communist ideology. As to the proletarian writers, while helping them in their growth and comprehensively supporting their organization, the party must firmly oppose communist boastfulness and capitulationism or any light-handed and scornful attitude toward cultural heritage and writing specialists. It must also struggle, the resolution points out, in pursuing Lenin's criticism of Proletkult, attempts at creating a strictly greenhouse "proletarian" literature.

In defining its attitude toward the basic literary groups, the party clearly stated that it guides literature as a whole, for which reason it cannot tie its hands by supporting any specific trend in terms of literary form and style. It firmly spoke out in favor of free competition in this area. The entire text of the resolution clearly indicates that the course of competition among literary groups meant, in the final account, a course toward their unification. This was the topic of the promise of help and support for each one of them and so did the demand of providing proper and tactful management of literature. This was also the meaning of defining the tasks and methods of criticism as one of the educational tools in the party's hands. Professional competence, the ability to identify the objective class meaning of a work of literature, reliance on ideological superiority and elimination of the tone of literary ordering, displaying the greatest possible tactfulness and tolerance of any literary strata which could join the proletariat were requirements formulated by the party toward the critics, aimed at promoting the unification of literature.

The resolution, which was extended to a number of most important literary problems, was aimed at literature as a whole. It included the demand that writers undertake the artistic development of the tremendous amount of material already acquired; paying attention to the development of national literatures, orienting the writers to the mass readers, to a form understood by millions of people and, finally, introducing for almost the first time the term "Soviet literature" as describing a new literature in general.

The unification course charted by the party was consistent with the basic trend in the development of our literature and of our society itself--the process of shaping a new historical community--the Soviet people. In the field of literature, this course charted by the Bolshevik Party won a decisive victory as confirmed by the VKP(b) Central Committee decree "On the Restructuring of Literary-Artistic Organizations" and the creation of a unified creative Soviet Writers' Union, and the proceedings of the First Writers' Congress. The congress's main theme was that of communist party-mindedness. Communist and non-party writers spoke of their support of the idea of party-mindedness and its importance in artistic creativity. It captured the consciousness of the creative intelligentsia. To use Gorkiy's metaphor, "the thunder of bolshevism was heard victoriously once again" at the Congress.

The assertion of a basic principle of our literature as that of national origin was an unquestionable merit of collective writers' thought alongside the principle of party-mindedness. Despite the vulgar sociological approach to art, which eliminated the nationality concept, improperly pitting it against the concept of class, Gorkiy's report and many other speeches developed Lenin's idea that the roots of art are found in the people, that art belongs to the people, that it expresses the people's thoughts and feelings and that it is called upon to serve precisely the people rather than an insignificant minority of "the connoisseurs of beauty."

One could say that one of the most important results of the proceedings of the congress was the approach which was noted at that time toward party-mindedness and nationality as the most important and interrelated principles of Soviet literature, the literature of socialist realism, as not only ideological and political but also as aesthetic categories, imbuing the ideological content and artistic fabric of the works.

The nerve, heart, conscience and honor of our literature and party-mindedness and nationality both enhanced it and themselves became enriched with the experience it acquired throughout the entire history of the Soviet state. They determined its main line--strengthening ties with the life of the people, the truthful and highly artistic depiction of socialist reality, the inspired and vivid identification of new and progressive features and passionate exposure of anything hindering social progress. The ideas of party-mindedness and nationality were developed at party congresses, Central Committee decrees and resolutions on ideological problems and problems of cultural construction and in the works of critics and literary experts.

The dialectics of the features of the people's and the national, the people's and the universal, the people's and the party's and the class and the patriotic acquired a new content in the light of the definition formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress, of the Soviet people as a "new social and international community." It indicates that under the conditions of real socialism nationality in Soviet society is acquiring international features, embodying the best universally significant features of the socialist nations which make up the Soviet people. In developing the national features in a socialist spirit, nationality offers universal scope to national literatures. One may say that the path from the national to the universal goes through the

development of nationality in the direction of socialism, where it develops into the superior form of ties between literature and the people--party-mindedness. "To live with the interests of the people," was pointed out at the congress, "to share with them joy and sadness, to assert the truth of our life and humanistic ideals and to be an active participant in the building of communism are what true nationality, true party-mindedness of art are."

In speaking of the development of the Leninist principle of party-mindedness and in general, of Lenin's thoughts, ideas and concepts, one must always have a clear idea of the direction followed in this development and its class content.

In this connection, we cannot fail to be amazed by the carelessness, the light-handedness of thoughts which some critics engage in, arbitrarily interpreting or ignoring Lenin's theory of the two cultures in each culture in bourgeois society. Our party press has already drawn attention to the inadmissibility of the arbitrary interpretation of absolutely clear and specific Leninist concepts, under the banner of their "creative development."

The true development of the principle of party-mindedness in our literature and criticism is based on the class approach to social phenomena and to the analysis and evaluation of works of art. Moral-psychological problems are becoming increasingly important in contemporary literature and occasionally considered as foundations for criticism. In itself, this is not bad. What is bad is when they are formulated and considered abstractly, alienated from sociopolitical problems, when the dialectics of class and universal features is ignored. Yet, this dialectics is as follows: aspiration toward the triumph of universal ideals and a class approach in their implementation.

The principle of party-mindedness demands that not only the present but the past as well be considered from the positions of the most progressive class of our time, the revolutionary working class. In its struggle against petit bourgeois individualism, the veneration of objects, threadbare practicalism and lack of spirituality, our literature has accomplished a truly patriotic exploit, bringing to light the beauty and greatness of the ideological and moral potential of the Soviet people, the tremendous wealth we have inherited. However, when some critics began to voice their support of by no means the best features of the past, and when the patriarchal and communal life-styles began to be presented as the supreme truth of popular life, this became subjectivistic arbitrariness and deviation from Marxist-Leninist methodology which, essentially, leads to suppressing the role of the working class in the Russian liberation movement and the role it played in shaping the new communist morality.

The question of deepening the content of party and national-mindedness and their further development and rapprochement becomes particularly important today, when the party has taken a course of comprehensive acceleration of socioeconomic progress, reaching a qualitatively new social status and energizing the human factor, to which our entire economic, ideological-political and social development is organically linked. "It is only through a well-planned economic strategy, strong social policy and purposeful ideological and educational work, carried out in a state of inseparable unity,

that the human factor, without which no single task we have formulated can be resolved, can be energized. That is precisely the way the problem is posed today," M. S. Gorbachev said at the October 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

Man, his toil and his well-being are the key problems of our party policy. Man in his interrelationship with society and nature and the shaping and growth of the individual are the permanent and main target of art and literature, described by Gorkiy and the "science of man." The more responsible the problems to be resolved by our society become, the higher the role of literature and art. The intensification of the economy and the human factor requires the intensification of literature itself.

How is this achieved? The ways are many, and all of them are related to the principle of party-mindedness and its development as an inner guideline of literary creativity. This involves, above all, upgrading the effectiveness of truthful writing, for writing is the work of the writer. Naturally, however, the written words must make the readers think, develop their initiative and increase their intolerance of shortcomings, telling them the truth, which may be bitter but also inspiring. This demands greater realism, socialist realism, for it is only the realistic reproduction of reality that can provide the true pictures of people's life, accomplishments and needs.

Until recently critics were still discussing the "tiredness" of our literature. I believe that there could not even be a question of any tiredness. It would be more accurate to speak of the intensive search which is being conducted in literature of late, feeling the ripe social need for a conversion to a new qualitative level and the fact that literature was internally ready for this is seen by the speed with which it reacted to the course charted by the party. This is also confirmed by the decisive struggle against literary rejects and grayness which has developed among writers and which, it is true, is by no means waged by our critics to the fullest extent as yet. A great deal has already been said of timidity, of the fear to insult one writer or another. However, it seems to me, it is also a question of the underdevelopment of criteria by which to judge the artistic value of works. Yet without scientific and tested party criteria, which determine the significance of an individual work within the overall literary process a consistent and efficient struggle against grayness in literature and the struggle for upgrading its ideological and artistic standards would be inconceivable.

The principle of party-mindedness provides a key to the solution of a number of problems related to intensifying the activeness of our literature. This includes the problem of the positive character, the problem of the heroic and the tragic, and the problem of the position taken by the author, which reveals, above all, the party-mindedness and national feelings of the artist. A phenomenon typical of late, which could be described as the politicizing of our literature, should also be considered from the viewpoint of party-mindedness and intensification of ideological struggle against the forces of imperialism and reaction. Such politicizing is not reduced to the appearance and development of genres such as political novel, political drama or political poetry. It covers all of literature, embodied within the artistic

system of the specific work. The same could be said of strengthening the philosophical principle in contemporary literature, which enables us to speak not only of the philosophical views of the author but also of the philosophy of literature itself, contained in artistic characters and depictions.

The energizing of literature means intensifying the impact which writing has on the reader, the people, on contemporary social life. Today the organic links with the people, inherited from our classics, are assuming ever new aspects. The aspiration to depict the life of the people ever more profoundly is determined by forms of individual or collective meetings between writers and readers and prototypes of their literary characters, such as the days of literature sponsored in our republics, oblasts and cities, creative evenings, literary debates, conferences, and trips to enterprises and kolkhoses by our writers. The experience of such meetings must be theoretically interpreted and summed up. It must be expanded with the specific sociological study of the readers' opinions and readers' letters to writers, publishing houses and the press, for the reader plays a tremendous role in the literary process. He is part of this process. No somewhat complete and objective idea of the impact of literature on life is possible without the study of the reader. A historical-functional approach to the study of the legacy of the past already exists and is developing in our literary studies. This approach must be expanded by the study of the effective role of contemporary Soviet literature. I would describe this approach as sociofunctional.

Finally, as we speak of the party-mindedness of our literature, we must not fail to mention a typical and important quality, such as aspiration to the future. The ability not only to see but to predict is inherent in the human mind in general and assumes a particular nature in artistic creativity. It is manifested most actively in the art of socialist realism, which depicts reality in its revolutionary development. In summing up the experience of Soviet literature and developing the thoughts of Marxist classics on art, Gorkiy, Lunacharskiy and other writers and critics introduced the category of the future into the aesthetics of socialist realism.

In one of his letters, written in 1933, pointing out Lenin's "rare ability to consider the present through the eyes of the future," Gorkiy pointed out that "it is precisely this height, this ability that must become the base of the type of 'socialist realism' which is being referred to as something new and necessary for our literature."

We believe that it is precisely now, when the fundamental party documents which will determine the path of our society in the 21st Century are being discussed by the whole people, that the striving toward the future by Soviet literature becomes even more important and needs a profound theoretical substantiation. The gnosiological approach to this problem leads us to the Leninist theory of reflection and the question of the activeness of the human mind and its ability to penetrate the future and to consistently reorganize surrounding reality. A specific form of such an active reflection of reality is precisely a literature which can anticipate the features of the future man and future relations among people and, above all, find and bring to light the shoots of the future within the present and assess the present from the

viewpoint of the future, the viewpoint of the communist ideal. This is perhaps the highest manifestation of communist party-mindedness.

The draft of the new edition of the CPSU program precisely defines the most important features of our literature as a continually developing literature. "The art of socialist realism," we read in it, "is based on the principles of nationality and party-mindedness. It combines daring innovation within a truthful artistic representation of life with the use and development of all progressive traditions of domestic and world culture. Workers in literature and the arts have a broad scope for a truly free creativity, for upgrading their skills and further developing the variety of realistic forms, styles and genres." This characteristic of Soviet literature pertains to both present and future. It provides a prototype of art of the future, of that "truly new, great communist art" of which Lenin dreamed and which, in his words, "will create a form consistent with its content."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/5



27 March 1986

## REALITIES OF THE CONTEMPORARY EPOCH

## ROAD OF CLOSER FRIENDSHIP AND COOPERATION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 85 (signed to press 28 Nov 85) pp 107-112

[Article by V. Kuzmenko, written on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of a republic in Yugoslavia]

[Text] At the peak of World War II, the second session of the Antifascist Veche of the People's Liberation of Yugoslavia was held in an area in the Bosnian Mountains, cleared from the fascist aggressors. Historical decisions were adopted at the session, which laid the foundations of a new people's Yugoslavia. AVNOYU [AntiFascist Veche of the People's Liberation of Yugoslavia] became the supreme legislative body of the country and a provisional government was set up--the National Committee for the Liberation of Yugoslavia. J. Broz Tito, commander-in-chief of the Yugoslav people's liberation army, was given the rank of marshal and appointed chairman of the committee. The resolution of the session stipulated that new Yugoslavia will become a federation of equal nations. The event occurred on 29 November 1943.

The Soviet people, who received news of the heroic struggle waged by the peoples of Yugoslavia with great sympathy, at the front and rear, were informed of this from an official communication entitled "On Events in Yugoslavia, issued by the Information Bureau of the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs," which was published in our press. Loyal to its invariable policy of fraternal support of the working people of Yugoslavia, the Soviet government stated in the report that the resolutions of the second AVNOYU will contribute to the successful struggle waged by the peoples against Hitlerite Germany.

Exactly 2 years later, on 29 November 1945, the Constituent Assembly, which had been elected shortly before that, approved in Belgrade the Declaration on the Proclamation of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia. Since that day, for the 40th time, the peoples of Yugoslavia celebrate this day as their major national holiday, known as Republic Day.

The new Yugoslav state was born in World War II. Together with the other peace-loving peoples, the peoples of Yugoslavia selflessly fought for their national and social liberation. In this struggle they were given moral and political support and material and military aid by the Soviet Union. The

Soviet people suitably acknowledged the great contribution made by Yugoslavia to the defeat of fascism. The Soviet people remember that on the day fascist Germany treacherously attacked our country, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia Central Committee called upon the peoples of Yugoslavia to engage in a decisive struggle. "The precious blood of the heroic Soviet people," the appeal read, "is not being shed for the sake of defending the socialist country alone but also for the definitive social and national liberation of all toiling mankind. Therefore, this is our struggle too and we must support it with all our forces...." On 4 July 1941 the CPY Central Committee passed the resolution of mounting an armed struggle. That same autumn the rebel armed forces in the various parts of the country had already liberated from the occupation forces and their local accomplices dozens of cities and a significant amount of territory on which the organs of revolutionary power were created and consolidated. In their 20 November 1941 greetings to the Yugoslav partisans, the Soviet partisans wrote: "We heard of your heroic exploits in the struggle against the German fascism. We are deeply confident that you, like we, will withstand in this heroic struggle against the common enemy until the time that, together with the great Red Army, we have destroyed fully and definitively German fascism." Three years later, as a result of joint combat operations by the forces of the Red Army and the Yugoslav People's Liberation Army, the northeaster parts of the country and Belgrade, the capital, were liberated.

The role of the Soviet Union in the defeat of fascism has always been noted in Yugoslavia. "Our peoples," wrote J. Broz Tito on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the proclamation of the Republic of Yugoslavia, "highly value the contribution of the Soviet Union and its great armed forces, which withstood the main burden of the war and played a decisive role in the victory over the dark forces of fascism. We shall never forget the many thousands of Soviet heroes who, in the course of this struggle and in the battlefields in Yugoslavia, shed their blood and gave their lives shoulder to shoulder with our own troops."

Having won their national and social freedom and having made a socialist revolution, the working class and all working people in Yugoslavia, headed by the communists, turned within a historically short time a previously backward country into a developed industrial-agrarian state and achieved major successes in its political, economic and cultural development. The April 1963 Constitution legislatively codified the results achieved by the working people in the country in the building of socialism. Yugoslavia took the name of Socialist Federal Republic.

Compared with 1947, the 1984 Yugoslav gross national product was higher by a factor of 7; 86 percent of it is generated in the public sector. Within a virtually similar period of time, the share of industry in the GNP increased from 18 to over 40 percent. The socialist sector in agriculture accounts for 44 percent of commodity output. Changes in the social structure of the society occurred with the transformation of Yugoslavia into a developed industrial-agrarian state.

The growth of the Yugoslav economy, industrial production above all, created conditions for the active development of its foreign economic relations.

Currently Yugoslavia maintains such relations with 139 countries throughout the world. The socialist countries account for up to 44 percent of its foreign trade.

The country's economic situation worsened at the start of the 1980s; the pace of national economic development slowed down, labor productivity began to decline and the quality indicators of economic organizations worsened. The great indebtedness to Western banks, totaling \$19 billion (repayment accounts for 45 percent of current foreign exchange earnings and about 5 percent of the national income), the steady price increases and other inflationary phenomena are reducing the efficiency of economic activities and adversely affecting the living standard of the working people. In order to resolve these problems, a special "Long-Term Program for Economic Stabilization" was drafted in 1983, to the implementation of which Yugoslavia is ascribing great importance. The course of implementation of this program has been repeatedly discussed by Yugoslav party and state bodies.

The domestic political situation was discussed in March 1985 at a joint session of the Yugoslav Presidium and the Presidium of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia Central Committee. It was emphasized that at the present time the main trends in the activities of all party, social and economic organizations is the implementation of the resolutions of the recently held LCY Central Committee Plenum, at which the results of the party-wide discussion were summed and the tasks were earmarked for strengthening the leading role of the League of Communists in social life and strengthening unity within its ranks. The participants in the meeting expressed their resolve to implement the set tasks and took efficient steps to resolve vital economic and other problems of Yugoslav development.

It was also noted that of late the subversive activities of antisocialist elements have become energized in Yugoslavia. In an effort to use to their advantage existing difficulties in the country's development, they are attacking the constitutional system and the basic revolutionary gains of the Yugoslav peoples. Nationalists are a significant danger. In this connection, the participants in the meeting indicated the need for prompt exposure and blocking efforts of hostile activities aimed against Yugoslavia.

Problems related to preparations for the forthcoming Thirteenth LCY Congress, scheduled for June 1986, were considered at the July 1985 LCY Central Committee Plenum. The plenum approved the platform for the forthcoming congress. As the draft platform stipulates, the objective of the LCY platform during the period of preparations for the congress will be to energize and direct the efforts of the entire society to the solution of economic, political, social and other problems. It emphasizes the need, above all, to eliminate the difficulties and shortcomings observed in the economy and in sociopolitical activities. Great significance is ascribed to the consistent implementation of the "Long-Term Economic Stabilization Program," the development of production forces and strengthening of international relations.

Tasks related to strengthening unit within LCY ranks and its vanguard role in society are ascribed a central role in the document. The draft also draws attention to the importance of the systematic implementation of the principle

of democratic centralism, to improving ideological work and to the struggle against antisocialist and pronationalist manifestations.

The international section of the platform notes that the struggle for peace and against the threat of nuclear war and pursuit of an active policy of peaceful coexistence and cooperation are primary tasks of all progressive forces. The League of Communists, the document points out, will continue to provide total support of all efforts aimed at the preservation of peace and strengthening security and cooperation, to the process of detente and to the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world, including the Balkans.

Yugoslavia bases its relations with other countries on the principles of respect for national sovereignty and equality, noninterference in the domestic affairs of other countries and resolution of international disputes through peaceful means. As one of the initiators and active participants in the nonalignment movement, it promotes peace and the prevention of nuclear catastrophe, disarmament, detente, opposition to imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, racism and apartheid and all forms of aggression, interference and domination and hegemony in politics and economics and favors the creation of a new international economic order.

Soviet-Yugoslav friendship, which originated centuries ago and which was tempered in the joint struggle against fascism, finds its embodiment in the development of comprehensive reciprocal relations serving the interests of the peoples of both countries and the strengthening of peace the world over. The reliable and tested foundation of these relations rests on the principles and agreements codified in joint documents drafted on the basis of Soviet-Yugoslav summit meetings. This is convincingly confirmed by the successful development of Soviet-Yugoslav relations in 1985.

The meeting between Comrade M. S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and high party and state Yugoslav leaders, held in Moscow last March, was a most important event. During the meeting both sides confirmed their reciprocal readiness for further intensification of comprehensive cooperation between the USSR and Yugoslavia and between the CPSU and the LCY.

Our cooperation has become truly comprehensive. It includes the planned implementation of relations between parties in a variety of forms, contacts between state bodies, republics and krais in the USSR and Yugoslavia, and between cities in both countries and trade union, youth, women's and other social organizations. Economic and scientific and technical cooperation has reached high standards. Relations are developing in the areas of culture and science.

Regular Soviet-Yugoslav political contacts are maintained. Thus, last July M. Planinc, chairman of the Yugoslav Union Executive Veche, paid an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union and was received by M. S. Gorbachev. In the course of the talk both sides noted with satisfaction the successful development of Soviet-Yugoslav relations in a number of areas; the steady aspiration of the CPSU and the LCY and of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia toward strengthening reciprocal understanding and mutual confidence and the

further intensification of fruitful cooperation were emphasized. The firm resolve was expressed persistently to promote the prevention of nuclear war and to strengthen peace and security in Europe, and encourage the radical improvement of the general international situation.

Parliamentary relations are developing between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. In October 1985 a delegation of the Yugoslav National Assembly paid a visit to our country, headed by its chairman I. Kurteshi. In the course of the talks between the Yugoslav parliamentarians and members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and A. A. Gromyko, USSR Supreme Soviet chairman, the reciprocal aspiration was noted to continue to develop the growing relations between the supreme legislative bodies of the two countries in the interest of strengthening Soviet-Yugoslav friendship and peace. The Yugoslav parliamentarians highly rated the new Soviet peace initiatives and emphasized firm Yugoslav support for the cause of peace and international cooperation.

Business relations between republics in the USSR and Yugoslavia are broadening. In March 1985, V. I. Vorotnikov, CPSU Politburo member and RSFSR Council of Ministers chairman, paid an official visit to Yugoslavia. In the course of the visit plans for cooperation in 1985-1987 between the Russian Federation and Serbia and Montenegro were coordinated, reflecting the general aspiration to develop mutually profitable relations within the framework of Soviet-Yugoslav relations for the benefit of the peoples of both countries.

Significant results were achieved in the area of Soviet-Yugoslav economic cooperation. The tasks stipulated in the "Basic Directions in the Implementation of the Long-Term Program for Economic and Scientific and Technical Cooperation Between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia for the Period Until the Year 1990" are being successfully implemented. The prospects for long-term economic interaction between the two countries between 1986 and 1990 were considered at last June's meeting of the Intergovernmental Soviet-Yugoslav Committee for Economic and Scientific and Technical Cooperation, held in Belgrade. This applied, above all, to intensifying and expanding production specialization and cooperation and utilizing in industry the latest scientific and technological achievements. The discussions also covered problems related to the implementation of trade and economic agreements. Preliminary estimates indicate that the volume of Soviet-Yugoslav trade this 5-year plan period will total approximately \$5 billion, i.e., it will be nearly twice the figure reached during the previous 5-year period.

Problems of economic cooperation accounted for a large part of the Soviet-Yugoslav communique on the results of the talks between the USSR Council of Ministers chairman and the chairman of the Yugoslav Union Executive Veche. Both sides expressed their satisfaction with its dynamic development and equal and mutually profitable nature, emphasizing that favorable opportunities exist for its further expansion in a variety of forms on a long-range basis. In particular, agreement was reached on the fact that through consultations both sides will pay particular attention to broadening cooperation in machine building, power industry, electronics, robotics, the chemical industry, deliveries of consumer goods, construction services, transportation and tourism. Reciprocal interest was noted in broadening cooperation in

agriculture, food industry and the agroindustrial complex as a whole. It was deemed necessary to speed up the formulation of joint suggestions relative to the further development and intensification of production specialization and cooperation, above all in priority economic sectors of both countries. Interest was expressed in implementing agreements on reciprocal procurements of ships and ship equipment for the 1986-1990 period and on further cooperation in that area. Noting the significance of the "Basic Directions in Scientific and Technical Cooperation Between the USSR and Yugoslavia Until the Year 2000," the parties agreed to formulate a long-term program for economic cooperation between the two countries for that period.

The Soviet Union is not only Yugoslavia's main trading partner. In accordance with intergovernmental agreements, it continues to assist Yugoslavia in the construction and reconstruction of more than 120 industrial enterprises and other national economic projects, 90 of which are already operational. In turn, Yugoslav organizations have built a number of national economic projects in the USSR.

Mutually profitable relations between Yugoslavia and the other socialist countries, the CEMA members above all, are also developing on a stable planned basis. Agreements between Yugoslavia and CEMA on Yugoslav participation in the work of CEMA bodies were concluded in 1964. Currently cooperation is developing in a number of areas, including various industrial, transportation, communication and construction sectors. Yugoslavia is a member of a number of international economic organizations of CEMA and maintains relations with its International Investment Bank and International Bank for Economic Cooperation. It is a signatory to 135 multilateral agreements on production specialization and cooperation and scientific and technical cooperation with CEMA countries. A protocol on Yugoslav participation in the implementation of the general agreement of cooperation among CEMA members in the development and production of microprocessor equipment was concluded at a recent meeting of the CEMA Committee on Scientific and Technical Cooperation, which was held in Belgrade for the first time. It is noted by Yugoslavia that the extensive interaction between it and CEMA is very promising.

Despite certain differences in their assessment of individual events in international life, broad opportunities exist for Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation in foreign policy. This was reasserted through the exchange of views on topical problems of the world's situation in the course of talks on the level of heads of Soviet and Yugoslav governments. In particular, the joint communique emphasized that the current international situation remains threatening and, in some respects, is becoming further aggravated. The further growth of nuclear and other types of weapons, the threat of extending the arms race to space, military conflicts and hotbeds of tension in various parts of the world and the threat of use of force demand the immediate efforts of all countries and peoples in the interest of strengthening peace and security, excluding war as a means of resolving disputes and turning relations back into the channel of detente and constructive cooperation on the basis of equality and respect for the independence and the right of nations to free development.



The common interest shown by the peoples of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia in strengthening peace and socialism and their aspiration to strengthen reciprocal friendship and to intensify cooperation are firm foundations on the basis of which Soviet-Yugoslav relations are developing successfully. The Soviet people are confident that fruitful comprehensive cooperation between the USSR and Yugoslavia and between the CPSU and the LCY will continue to strengthen in the interest of the peoples of both countries and the cause of peace and socialism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/5

## 25TH CONGRESS OF THE FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY: HOPES AND STRUGGLE FOR THE FUTURE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 85 (signed to press 28 Nov 85) pp 113-121

[Article by Maxim Gremetz, French Communist Party Politburo member and FCP Central Committee secretary]

[Text] The experience gained by the French people in recent years has raised a number of questions on the part of all those who, throughout the world, are struggling for the cause of progress, social justice, democracy, peace and socialism. The election of F. Mitterrand as president of the republic in 1981 and, subsequently, the formation of a cabinet which included four communist ministers, triggered great interest and hopes in France and abroad. However, the gradual worsening of the economic and social situation in the country, the withdrawal of the Communist Party from the government and the abandonment of its electoral promises by the socialist government in the areas of domestic and foreign policy, as well as the dark prospects for 1986, the year of parliamentary elections, led to the fact that hope was initially replaced by scepticism, and then by concern on the part of the broad social circles.

Naturally, these problems became the center of debates which took place within our party in the course of preparations for its 25th congress and, subsequently, at the FCP Congress itself, which was held in February 1985.

I shall make no effort to "sum up" within the framework of an article the many months of debates which were held within the party and all the work done at the congress. I intend, however, to draw attention to the basic conclusions which stem from the French communists' assessment of acquired experience, and to single out the prospects which the French Communist Party offers to our people.

As stated in the resolution adopted at the 25th FCP Congress, an entire period in the history of our party is drawing to an end. It is a question not only of the 3 years since 1981 but of a quarter of a century, in the course of which, on the basis of a joint governmental program adopted by leftist forces, initially a plan for a leftist cabinet was drawn up and, subsequently, after the 1981 victory, a leftist government was set up in France. This statement emphasizes the idea which has deeply penetrated the awareness of French communists: in order to understand the events taking place in our country and

draw the necessary conclusions from them we must not limit ourselves to the study of the 3-year participation of communists in the government.

At its previous congresses, the FCP had already evaluated the reasons for the difficulties which had appeared in its activities and defined the main trends of a new policy for France and its people. It had developed a strategy for a French-style democratic way to socialism, a socialism based on self-management. However, it is precisely because our party had fallen behind in answering the topical problems facing French society that many of those who aspired to social progress and to the development of democracy in our country retained approaches and ways of action inherent in the strategy of programmatic summit agreements concluded between socialists and communists.

#### What Is Our Strategy?

The objective of the type of socialism which we wish for France is one of satisfying the expectations of the people for justice and fraternity and meeting the needs for freedom and participation in social affairs. Its objective is to enrich relations among people. It is a question of ensuring for the working people and the people's masses optimal working and living conditions and precisely offering them a choice in determining their own fate and the fate of our country. These objectives are consistent with the traditions of our country and its characteristic features and meet the spirit of our time.

Therefore, the projects for a socialist society we offer stems from the needs of the masses themselves and the country as a whole. The way to attain this objective, suggested by our party, is also consistent with the specific realities of the contemporary world and of today's France, which is experiencing the crisis of the capitalist system.

As the aggressiveness of the most reactionary circles of imperialism is increasing, imperialist policy is encountering increasing obstacles. Forces exist in the world which can force these circles to display realism, observe the principles of peaceful coexistence and respect the will of peoples and countries. This, precisely, is the decisive factor governing international circumstances in recent decades. It is precisely this reality that offers the people of France the possibility of advancing toward socialism in an original French way, consistent with the traditions and expectations of the French people.

Such are the foundations on which our party's strategy is built. Progress toward socialism in France will take place under the influence of the dynamics of the popular majority. This movement will expand as a result of new social and democratic gains and the will of this majority will be manifested in the results of the general vote. Our party has firmly taken the democratic path of struggle for the creation of a socialist society, which presumes progress toward socialism not as some distant objective but as a vital need. This path does not mean in the least a rejection of the struggle for a profound change. Conversely, it presumes a fierce class struggle against the enemies of democratic change, who are using all means at their disposal for purposes of deceit and division and for distorting the nature of our policy and

suppressing the democratic movement. The purpose of our strategy is a change within society and its liberation in all areas from the domination of exploiting capital. We deem it possible, in accordance with the resolutions of the 22nd FCP Congress, to avoid in this struggle, bearing in mind the conditions in France, the concept of "dictatorship of the proletariat."

### Crisis in French Society

The main, the defining feature of French society today is the crisis. Its main reason is found in the social system itself, in the capitalist organization of society. This is by no means a speculative postulate but a result of serious and accurate analysis.

During the 1950s and 1960s France faced new large-scale needs of economic development. Let us note that some progress was achieved in that area. However, these changes took place within the framework of capitalism, i.e., of a system whose basic law is not the development of the individual but the striving for maximally possible financial profitability of capital and acquired wealth, whereas the strengthening and growth of economic results required an even greater social organization, i.e., a socialist society.

During that period the capitalists significantly increased their profits and expanded their enterprises. They created extensive financial wealth through profits and loans. The richer they became, the more persistently they strove toward new profits in order to increase their capital investments. For that reason, big capital tried to reduce outlays for vocational training and skilled labor wages, resorting to inexpensive and unskilled manpower. This led to a slowdown in the growth rates of labor productivity and narrowed the markets. The creation of material values took place at a slower pace than the superaccumulation of capital, thus lowering capital profitability. The policy pursued by big capital increasingly contributed to the intensification of the crisis. It was inflation that was accelerated above all. Along with increased exploitation of the working people, loss of jobs and lowering of the purchasing power, it aggravated the problem of commodity marketing. French capital was relying on exporting industrial commodities to other countries. However, since the other capitalist countries as well took the path of foreign expansion, economic warfare broke out on the world market, the result of which was France's curtailed opportunities on foreign markets. New aspects in big capital policy drastically aggravated existing problems: breakdown of leading industrial sectors, closing down of enterprises with a view to converting productive into financial capital oriented toward speculative operations and transfer of profits to the nonproduction sphere, buying controlling shares of stock, etc.

The result was the further aggravation of the crisis which, in addition to the economy, spread to all realms of social life, disturbed the social fabric and triggered new contradictions and complications and new difficult problems to resolve.

## The Question of the 'Strategic Lagging' of the FCP

The FCP was the first French political party which, as early as 1971, exposed the existence of this crisis and describe its nature. Starting with its 22nd congress, our party began to draw from this conclusions for its policy, laying the foundations for a new strategy. In 1981 the FCP concentrated its political campaign related to the forthcoming presidential elections on a plan for the struggle against the crisis, aimed at achieving a real solution to it, and intensified its assessment of the crisis, formulated in the lecture delivered by G. Marchais at the Central Party School, entitled "French Challenge With a View to Surmounting the Crisis" (see KOMMUNIST No 1, 1983). These facts must be recalled in order to emphasize the profound innovative role of the FCP against the background of the policies of other political forces in the country, which misled our people and are continuing to do so. Ever since its birth in 1920, the FCP has most actively participated in the struggle for the interests of the working people.

It has always emphasized the need for the creation of a class-oriented and mass trade union, independent of the entrepreneurs, the state and political parties, regardless of what is taking place in countries where social democrats dominate the labor movement, and the need for a party capable of acting independently in the interests of the working people. For the past 65 years the FCP has actively participated in the battles for the freedom and dignity of the people; it played an outstanding role in the long and difficult struggle against the colonial war. It invariably proceeds on the basis of the positions of international solidarity. Throughout its entire history our party has struggled for the independence of France, friendship among peoples and peace. The celebration of the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism gives us the right and the reason to point out yet once again, that without the French Communist Party, which earned the name of the "party of the executed," France would not have been what it is today.

This must be mentioned if we are to appreciate in its entirety the irreplaceable role of the FCP and the importance of the intensification of its political influence in the country. For it is a fact that it is precisely during the period when our party was seriously renovating its policy that a significant decline in its influence among voters occurred and the failures experienced by the FCP substantially intensified the trend toward the weakening of its positions, which was the result of a lagging in the formulation of this new political line.

Although we criticize some parts of the history of our party we have no intention whatsoever of questioning the basic purposes of its policy, which have always been to protect the interests of the working people, the struggle for socialism, or one type of action or another taken in its time. The purpose of the criticism is to bring to light the reasons for which at a certain stage the overall political line of the FCP restrained our activities, as well as the serious consequences to the overall conditions of the class struggle in France to which this led and which are being felt to this day.

The need for profound changes in social life arose most seriously in the mid-1950s in France. The big bourgeoisie rapidly reorganized itself in that direction. Unfortunately, this could not be said of our party. We failed to see on time the problems which were in the center of the political struggle and found ourselves unprepared to answer them accurately. A resolution adopted at the 25th party congress noted that the FCP had fallen behind in formulating an approach to the question of socialism for France and its correlation with the current "model," and in defining a future consistent with the conditions of our time.

In the aftermath of the 20th CPSU Congress, our party gave a restrictive interpretation to the essential questions which had been raised at that congress and to the national ways of transition to socialism and relations among communist parties. The FCP even erred in assessing the nature of the system of the Fifth Republic in France at the time it was established in 1958.

Our party interpreted the events taking place at that time, marked by acute class confrontations on a national and international scale, as an unexplainable and dangerous backward historical movement. It sought answers to the questions raised by life itself in past experience, essentially in the experience of the French Popular Front, considering the alliance among leftist parties only on the basis of a joint governmental program as the main axis of its policy. Since this formulation of the question was erroneous, the solutions we suggested turned out erroneous as well.

Under circumstances in which the crisis in society has raised the question of its change, we focused the political struggle and expectations of the popular masses on democratic changes of a limited nature. As a result of this erroneous concept, we also concentrated on the task of developing an alliance with the socialist for the elections.

This line had and continues to have an influence in the attitude of the working people toward our party and on the way the communists themselves conceive of their objectives and prospects in the political struggle.

Nevertheless, the experience we gained was not entirely negative. Awareness of the need for democratic changes became widespread. Major positions were taken away from the right wing parties. However, the overall result of this period was quite insignificant compared with the expectations of the working people and the scope of mass demands for change.

The key problem--the need for radical change aimed at undermining the role of capitalism--was suppressed. This occurred not because our party failed to see the need for it. The point is that, unable to provide a proper answer consistent with the new conditions of the class struggle in our country, the FCP actually contributed to the dissemination of illusions among the working people that the victory of leftist forces at the elections would automatically entail profound changes in France.

Thus, for example, finding itself trapped in the search for an agreement with the Socialist Party for a joint governmental program (at that time the Socialist Party was refusing such an agreement), our party failed to make use



of the entire potential of the broad popular movement which had developed in 1968, which could have resulted in major social and democratic gains.

Conversely, after this type of agreement was reached with the socialist party, the view that we could do without any stress, or a mass and lengthy political and ideological struggle, needed to clarify the nature of the crisis and the means of resolving it, predominated within our party. Social demands were considered only as a lever for exerting pressure on the top in order, initially, to help conclude an agreement for a joint governmental program and subsequently to maintain such a policy.

In its analysis of that period, our 25th party congress particularly emphasized that a policy based on a joint governmental program intensified the negative nature of the governmental institutions of the Fifth Republic in terms of the FCP. The nature of these institutions may be reduced to the following: in the presidential elections held each 7 years a head of state is elected, who concentrates within its hands tremendous power. He is opposed by the leader of the opposition; as a result of the parliamentary elections, which are held each 5 years, a parliamentary majority and an opposition develop; thus, a clear trend toward a bipolar structure in French political life is established.

Therefore, while the struggle against the crisis steadily demanded of the revolutionary party to pursue an autonomous and original policy, and to increase its influence on the mass movement for the sake of profound changes, as a result of the concluded agreements for a joint governmental program between communists and socialists, a significant percentage of the working people reached the view that differences between the socialist and communist parties had been eliminated in terms of the nature of democratic changes and the very approach taken by both parties to a leftist alliance.

Meanwhile, the administration and the Socialist Party, which made maximal use of the state institutions and the existing electoral system, and who actively encouraged anticommunism, succeeded in developing the widespread opinion of the need for a change in the ratio of forces in the left camp in favor of the Socialist Party and the strengthening of their positions to the detriment of the Communist Party.

Naturally, our party did not lose track of the nature and character of the Socialist Party, its fear of the movement of the working class and the people's masses, its hesitations concerning the possibility of the development of the class struggle against big capital and its tendency to compromise with capitalism and to support class cooperation. However, a policy based on a joint governmental program had sunk deep roots within the masses and, despite our efforts and initiatives, the Communist Party was unable to change the course of affairs. The negative trends of this policy continued to be felt tangibly, including within the FCP itself. Our party found itself forced to oppose obsolete concepts and customs with a new policy. However, a certain amount of time is needed before the radical changes in our strategy, which presume a revision of the old customs and positions, may take place.

The uncompromising nature of this criticism of our own policy and our actions is entirely clear. Our party bears its share of responsibility for the illusions which were created on the basis of the experience of the last 25 years and which are at the base of today's difficulties. However, we believe that throughout this quarter of a century the FCP pursued a fruitful and active policy. Encountering difficulties and occasionally persecuted, the Communist Party courageously fulfilled its duty. It was the only party which systematically defended the interests and rights of the working people, the only party which struggled against the colonial wars and for national independence and peace. Without an FCP and its courageous struggle, the social and democratic changes achieved at that time, would have been impossible and so would have the successes achieved by the French labor movement in the struggle for the cause of peace. At the same time, the efficiency and significance of these activities by the FCP became considerably weakened and the party itself suffered a number of major failures under the existing circumstances of overall adverse political conditions and the actions of the Socialist Party.

Without in the least questioning the basic trends of the policy set at previous party congresses, taking into consideration the evolution experienced by the country and our party, we deem it necessary comprehensively to strengthen our new strategy under the conditions of the further aggravation of the crisis and the fatal nature of solutions suggested both by the right-wing forces and the Socialist Party. This necessity is triggered by the development of events in the country and the increased requirements and expectations of the masses. It is also confirmed by the rich experience acquired by the working people and our party in recent years.

Therefore, a new foundation for progress has been laid, although we should by no means belittle the obstacles on the way to achieving our objectives.

#### Create a New People's Majority Union

The deeper study of contemporary capitalist society in France leads to the conclusion that the only possible solution to the crisis is a democratic advance toward socialism, based on self-management. From this viewpoint, the development of a mass movement by the working people interested in the implementation of one anti-crisis measure or another, assumes decisive significance.

Our party has set fundamental objectives in four most important areas. As a whole they offer a specific plan for resolving the crisis, a plan which can mobilize the toiling masses. They are the following: above all, the development of industrial production and the economy as a whole on the basis of national resources and with a view to opening new jobs and creating new material values. Our party points out that this objective can be attained if funds are invested in the economy in order to increase employment rather than be used as a source of new financial speculations.

Furthermore, it is a question of ensuring the country's progress toward social justice and cohesion. This implies the extensive development of the social security and vocational training systems, higher wages from top to bottom, and

reducing income from capital. These are the means which would contribute to progress along this way. Furthermore, a link must be established between employment and vocational training, involving a review of the content and methods of training as a whole and the establishment of a broad permanent system for training skilled cadres. It is self-evident that a new policy will be required in the areas in wages and taxes and steps taken to improve health care, develop housing construction and transportation and ensure the citizen's safety.

The third target is to ensure the democratization of the entire political and social life in the country, grant new rights to the working people and all citizens in the realm of information, insure their participation in social affairs and enable them to make decisions themselves. In this connection, our party congress formulated nine specific suggestions aimed at the democratization of French governmental institutions. It also called for a profound reform in the mass information media, which have now become a real war machine aimed at the working people, at any progressive ideas and at the communists.

Finally, the fourth stipulation suggested by our party pertains to French international politics: active opposition to any form of external pressure, restoration French influence in the world and making maximal use of its potential in the interests of economic development and activities jointly with the peoples of other countries for the sake of peace, disarmament and progress.

These suggestions formulated by our party do not constitute a governmental program claiming to provide a global solution of the problems facing the country. The party does not consider them the focus of the electoral struggle or as any kind of electoral platform which would be implemented by the government, should it win the elections. Experience has confirmed that this kind of approach leads to a dead end street. Our suggestions reflect an overall approach, an innovative concept of apolitical line: by formulating them, our party tries to make a contribution to the common struggle against the crisis. We submit them as a topic for consideration and discussion by anyone interested in developing the struggle against the crisis.

This new concept offers the working people the opportunity of deciding for themselves how and for the sake of what they must struggle, without dooming them to the role of "pawns" with decisions made by the headquarters of political parties, which would determine what is possible and what is not. We are not postponing for the future the unification of the masses in the struggle or their intervention in resolving the difficult problems facing the country. The communists are suggesting solutions which undermine the very foundations of the capitalist system.

Our party wants to provide possibilities for achieving such objectives as of now.

This new approach to a practical conduct of policy and to engaging in activities against the crisis creates prerequisites for the broadest possible unification of the masses in problems such as employment, increased

production, struggle for peace, etc. A real possibility exists of rallying in the struggle people of different social statuses or holding different philosophical, political or religious views, i.e., anyone interested in the formulation of measures to surmount the crisis.

Since socialism will be built in France by the people of our country themselves and at a pace consistent with their expectations, socialism can only mean a specific answer to the specific problems of society, problems triggered by the crisis; the democratic transition to socialism will take place on the basis of the extensive unification among the various categories of working people. We cannot postpone for the future the solution of crucial problems demanded by the needs of the masses. We must as of now try to resolve them on the basis of this kind of broad unification.

Quite naturally, such a strategy presumes the need for a higher standard of political and ideological work by the Communist Party. It does not allow postponements in resolving ripe problems but presumes the development of the struggle, mass action and continuing explanation of views related to the key problems of building socialism toward which we aspire in France: the creation of a society of social justice, ensuring a new economic growth, developing democracy and self-management, broadening human rights, ensuring the renaissance of national culture and establishing new relations among people.

Does this strategy mean that our party is rejecting the significance of the elections or the possibility of agreements among political parties, between the FCP and the Socialist Party in particular?

Naturally, it does not. The need for such agreements remains, providing that they are consistent with the real condition of the mass movement and do not promote illusions but, conversely, contribute to the development of this movement.

In the time since the 25th congress, the country's economic and social situation continued to worsen. The socialist government is surrendering one position after another, and has undermined the faith in what French left-wing forces have always represented. It has violated its promises made in 1981 and failed to justify the tremendous hope which the electoral victory of the left generated at that time. Today the policy of the government and the Socialist Party resembles in all essential areas the policy pursued by the forces of big capital. Increasingly, the government is yielding to their demands, drifting toward a reactionary policy. This applies to both the domestic and foreign policies of the government.

In pursuing this course, the socialist government itself creates favorable prerequisites for the energizing of the activities of right-wing forces who are trying to come back to power.

Henceforth, the Socialist Party has set as its target to garner at the next parliamentary elections 30 percent of the vote, and is promoting the weakening of the Communist Party. Its main target for the 1986 elections, is while yielding the power to the right-wing parties in parliament, to retain its positions for the struggle which will be waged at the 1988 presidential

elections. What is this if not a strategy of defeat, which confirms the basic political lesson of the now ended historical period: any weakening of the Communist Party leads to a defeat of the popular movement and the progressive forces in our country.

An Influential Communist Party is Needed for the Sake of the Country's Present and Future

Naturally, the FCP does not intend to tolerate a strategy of defeat. A solution exists, and the victory of right-wing forces in 1986 is not inevitable.

Actually, a policy different from the one followed by the current socialist government and the one which the right-wing parties intend to pursue, should they regain power, is possible. Our country has all the necessary means for changing such a policy. However, this requires political will. It is necessary, above all, for the Communist Party to have a sufficient influence and be able to pursue its strategy efficiently. The FCP must be stronger than the other political parties who favor continuing a policy of "rigid economy."

A powerful popular movement, hammered out step by step in the struggle against the crisis, a movement based on cohesion which will appear and strengthen in the course of class battles, is needed in order to resolve the crucial problems continuously encountered by the working people.

Hence the need for a stronger Communist Party. Our party is formulating its new policy together with the popular masses.

A turn for the better can be made at the forthcoming 1986 parliamentary elections. Those who make promises and fail to keep them, and those who run the country in the interest of a privileged class should in no case rely on the support of the FCP. The FCP has been and remains ready to participate alongside other political forces in the administration of the country, in order to contribute to the solution of the problems facing it and the people, a solution to the crisis and a change in society. This position, which was expressed in the report submitted by G. Marchais at the 25th congress, is unequivocal. The FCP is turning to the working people with the appeal to support more actively the communists and to defeat the right-wing forces and, relying on the struggle and the results of the vote, to ensure the victory of the innovative suggestions formulated by our party.

Since the 25th congress, our party has been working precisely in that direction. It proclaimed that "1,000 meetings for the sake of the future" will take place throughout the country, in the course of which communists will meet with working people and will discuss problems with them. Our suggestions are meeting with the growing support of the population. The struggle is growing and the combative spirit of the working people is strengthening, although a great deal remains to be done for it to reach the necessary scope and for new frontiers to be attained.

The FCP is not down on its knees. It is full of strength.

As an instrument of revolutionary policy, our party is intensifying its activities. Democratic centralism, the basic principle in its functioning, enables it to take even more completely into consideration the conditions of the contemporary class struggle and to intensify the participation of every party member in the elaboration and execution of our policy. Reality is confirming the accuracy of this situation.

The problems which our party is resolving are difficult and complex. However, the course of events after its 25th congress convincingly proves that a communist party working for the sake of creating a new unity among the majority of the people in France has a great future.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/5



## LITERARY CRITICISM AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

### BOOKS OF THE TERRIBLE YEARS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 85 (signed to press 28 Nov 85) pp 122-126

[Review by I. Pozdeyeva, candidate of historical sciences, and A. Samsonov, academician]

[Text] The historical study and interpretation of the path covered by the Soviet people to the victory over the fascist aggressor, for the sake of which for 4 years tens of millions of people spared neither themselves nor their lives, is a task for many generations. Whatever aspect of this great patriotic struggle we may consider--military, political, organizational or ideological--each one of them demanded the tremendous stressing of the efforts of our entire people. The unparalleled concentration of intellectual and creative energy and the striking moral firmness and sacrificial and all-embracing love for the homeland were the weapons with which, alongside combat materiel, our victory was hammered out.

The books which were published during wartime became chronicles of this exploit of the peoples of the Soviet Union. In the battle between the forces of humanism and fascism the pen--the symbol of the fiery words leading into battle--was really compared to a bayonet as a symbol of the armed struggle and bread, as the symbol and source of life.

The slogan "Everything for the Front, Everything for Victory!" became a law of life during the war. This meant radical restructuring of the Soviet press as well. Implementing the most difficult tasks set by the 29 June 1941 USSR Sovnarkom and VKP(b) Central Committee directive required a structural reorganization of the entire publishing industry. Furthermore, new types of press appeared--front-line, partisan and clandestine. From the very first days of the Great Patriotic War the printed organs of the Soviet Union undertook with unparalleled scope and efficiency to implement a program based on V.I. Lenin's principle that "...making the masses aware of the objectives of and reasons for the war is of tremendous significance and ensures victory" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 41, p 121).

The solution of this problem affected above all the volume and size of military, military-patriotic and military-technical publications, which accounted for about 40 percent of all printed matter which came out between

1941 and 1945. The average number of copies per edition increased from 10,100 (1934-1940) to 13,800 in 1941 and 22,600 in 1942. The need for mass editions despite a drastic cut in newsprint production and the loss of production facilities on territories temporarily occupied by the enemy made necessary a considerable drop in the average volume of books in wartime from 6.2 printer's sheets before the war to 2.1 in 1942.

The "Chronicle of Books," which continued publications throughout the war, counted 109,000 editions totaling in excess of 1,691,000,000 copies. The most important task of agitation-propaganda work was supplying the army and the country with literature which took to the people the invincible words of Marxism-Leninism. During the war the works of K. Marx, F. Engels and V. I. Lenin came out in more than 500 editions (about 17 million copies). No less than 16 percent of all books published during that time dealt with the immediate events of the Great Patriotic War; 12 percent of all printed matter was fiction and 4 percent was publications for children.

In the hands of the party and the state the press was an invaluable lever in terms of its influence on reorganizing the entire life of the country on a military footing--organizational, economic, spiritual and psychological. Under wartime conditions the printed word was to become maximally efficient. The need for information felt by millions of people increased sharply. A natural process of increasing closeness between the periodical press and books occurred, which contributed to their reciprocal enrichment and helped books to become more relevant, efficient and active. During the war all that was best and important was immediately transferred from newspapers to books. During the war period, mastering the efficiency of periodicals, books were printed and distributed not after months and years but days or weeks in the aftermath of events.

The depth and sharp political enthusiasm and national nature of literature at war was significantly ensured by the fact that many Soviet prose and poetry writers worked as front military correspondents; 943 professional writers were regular Red Army members; 220 worked in the newspapers of fronts, navies, armies and flotillas; hundreds of famous literary workers in the country died the death of the brave in carrying out their civic duty. Outstanding works were published for the first time in the press: on 24 July 1941 "Sacred War," the poem by V. Lebedev-Kumach was published simultaneously in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA and IZVESTIYA; as the lyrics of a song, it came to symbolize the Great Patriotic War; in January 1942 PRAVDA published K. Simonov's poem "Wait for Me," became every soldier's embodiment of loyalty and hope; Vasilii Terkin, the Russian soldier, marched into eternity in "every company" and "every squad," from the pages of KRASNOARMEYSKAYA PRAVDA, the newspaper of the Western Front. The press carried the stories "Rainbow," by V. Vasilevskaya, "The Unconquered," by B. Gorbатов, "Immortal Nation," by V. Grossman and "They Fought for the Homeland" by M. Sholokhov; the plays "Russian People" by K. Simonov and "Front Line" by A. Korneychuk; the poems "Kirov is With Us" by N. Tikhonov, "Zoya" by M. Aliger and "Pulkovo Meridian" by V. Inber; the essays "Russian Character" by A. Tolstoy and "The Science of Hatred" by M. Sholokhov and thousands of other works.

The social impact of printed matter and its efficiency and military-historical role in the Patriotic War intensified. Today all of this must be thoroughly researched. However, this is possible only by studying all forms of printed matter as a single complex inseparable from the events of the war. The characteristic features of wartime books included, above all, accuracy and efficiency in the choice and solution of topics based on the interests and initiative of each organization and individual involved in the struggle against hated fascism.

One of the outstanding features of wartime books was that such books were created by literally the entire fighting country. The complexity and overburdening of transportation channels and demand for maximal efficiency by the press dictated the need to broaden publishing work in the local areas. Efficient reprinting of party and government documents and the war materials of the central press was carried out, and fiction and works of world and Russian classics were published in Tashkent, Yaroslavl, Sverdlovsk, Perm (Molotov), Chelyabinsk, Magadan, Gorkiy, Alma-Ata, Yerevan, Kazan and dozens of other cities.

The publications of political administrations of fronts and navies and political departments of armies, divisions and other military formations remain a most important yet so far uncollected and insufficiently studied part of the military press; this includes millions of copies of newspapers, leaflets, combat leaflets, books and pamphlets on problems of tactics and strategy, the mastery of all types of weapons, vigilance, agitation and propaganda, and historical and medical problems; it includes fiction, militant satire and songs and military folklore....

The heroic traditions of our people played an exceptional role in the mobilization of all Soviet people in the battle against fascism. Tremendous interest in the country's past became a most powerful weapon in the Patriotic War. The understanding of this role was truly universal. Born of the masses and directed by the party, it was included in the party and government documents and formulated in J. V. Stalin's speech delivered at the 7 November 1941 Red Square parade as a national slogan: "May you draw inspiration in this war from the courageous image of our great forefathers Aleksandr Nevskiy, Dmitriy Donskiy, Kuzma Minin, Dmitriy Pozharskiy, Aleksandr Suvorov and Mikhail Kutuzov! May you walk under the shadow of the victorious banner of the great Lenin!"

From the very beginning of the war the printed word became the carrier of the concept of the relevance of historical experience. The initial "military" issues of "Book Chronicle" (July 1941) reported in the section "Heroic Past of the Soviet People" the publication of four pamphlets on the war against the Germans in 1914-1918; two others dealt with the struggle against the White Finns and three more on the wars fought by the Russian people against German aggressors starting with the 13th Century. In its following issue, "Chronicles" (15 August) listed in that section 28 new book titles. We are amazed not only by the efficiency with which historical books were published and the scope of military-historical themes but also by the number of publications and the high standard of creative and scientific forces involved in this important project. Between July 1941 and December 1942, during the 17

most difficult months of the war (based on partial data and without information on published works in Leningrad and books produced by the front press), no less than 86 works were published in 22 cities and in 12 languages of the peoples of the Soviet Union, dealing with four of the greatest military leaders of the past--Aleksandr Nevskiy, Dmitriy Donskiy, Aleksandr Suvorov and Mikhail Kutuzov. Forty-two of them (in the Russian language) were published in 3.7 million copies; furthermore, eight different books on the same military leaders were produced within that period by Voenizdat as part of the most popular and widespread "Red Armyman's Library." This work involved the participation of several dozen authors, including most noted historians, such as Ye. V. Tarle, S. V. Bakhrushin, V. I. Picheta, M. V. Mechkina, V. V. Danilevskiy and others. All in all, during the Great Patriotic War a total of 768 books on historical topics were published, 227 of which in 1942. Several dozen of them were written by the oldest party member Ye. M. Yaroslavskiy; 10 or more works were prepared for publication and published during the war by S. V. Bakhrushin, I. I. Mints and A. M. Pankratova.

Marching in the rank of the forces fighting fascism was not only Russia's heroic past but also the history of the struggle waged by the oppressed the world over, from the Roman slaves to France enslaved by the Hitlerites; the history of all just wars and world culture, exposing the fact that Nazism was turning toward Medieval obscurantism. Suffice it to recall a 1943 publication as the collection issued by the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of History "Partizanskaya Borba v Natsionalno-Osvoboditelnykh Voynakh Zapada" [Partisan Struggle in Western National Liberation Wars] (signed to press on 25 June 1943, published in 20,000 copies), which included articles on the Russian Partisans in Czechia, the guerrilla actions in the Netherlands and Garibaldi's "Thousand" in Sicily. An example showing with particular emphasis the impact of historical books is that of the memoirs of Armand de Colaincourt on Napoleon's campaign in Russia and the routing of his army, which the entire world considered invincible. The principle of the consideration of history as a source of experience, continuity and inflexible faith in victory was inherent in virtually all or almost all publications dealing with art, music and literature. A. Romm, whose booklet on the monument to Peter the Great in Leningrad was published in that heroic city in 1944, wrote the following on this subject in his preface: "Remembering the victorious struggle which Peter waged against foreign invasion, his monument combines the former glory of Russian arms with military heroics of today... Heroic Leningrad was able to safeguard the statue of its founder in the same manner that it was able to defend its honor, freedom and historical glory."

Particularly noteworthy are materials describing the awareness of the participants in the war of the fact that everyone of them was making history through his struggle and toil. This thought imbues all printed matter published during the Patriotic War, from the editions of the USSR Academy of Sciences to the daily front press. Actively contributing to such work were the activities of the commissions on the history of the Great Patriotic War, the first of which was set up in Moscow at the end of 1941 and the others, which were organized later in the various areas. Interest in the publication of works on historical-patriotic topics contributed to the appearance of a unique process which spread among the majority of Red Army formations: the preparations for and writing of the history of combat units participating in

the great battles. Unfortunately, a significant number of such documents remain unpublished to this day. However, a number of such books came out at the very beginning of the war and played a military-political and social role. The extent of this process is confirmed, in particular, by the methodical letters and recommendations addressed to political education institutions and historical-local history museums in the country, issued as early as 1942 by the Scientific Research Institute of Regional Studies and Museum Work. These publications provided detailed instructions on the search for material and documentary items related to the war, the gathering, recording and processing of data on monuments and memorable battles sites, using local data and communiques issued by Sovinformburo for the preparation of museum exhibits, etc.

No source could describe as vividly as books the mass and universal faith in our final victory, a faith which remained inflexible even during the most difficult and tragic periods of the war. In the autumn of 1941, when the enemy had reached the approaches to Moscow, when the blockade around Leningrad had been completed, the seamen of the Baltic Fleet were fighting together with the land forces and the city's population in its suburbs. Bread rations had been reduced once again; the city was almost continuously bombed and shelled by the enemy and it appeared as though its fate had been decided. During these most difficult days the book "Balflot Smeyetsya" [The Baltic Fleet is Laughing], which opened with the following poem by poetess O. Berggolts, who had remained in Leningrad, came out:

The fierce enemy is at the walls,  
Frenziedly hurling himself at the city,  
There is trouble....However, meanwhile,  
The Baltic Fleet is laughing....  
Let us see if,  
When we shall be approaching Berlin,  
Will those there be able  
To laugh about anything.  
We firmly know that we shall win!  
We shall surmount whatever comes.  
And thunderously over its enemy  
The Baltic Fleet is laughing.

Wartime books are today an irreplaceable source of study of history also because they combine the fate of the country, the people, the fighting armed forces and the destinies of authors, publishers, printers and readers. They help us to see, to understand and to feel the great and infinite events and to compare the facts they record with the great accomplishments of the time.

While the enemy was fiercely rushing toward the Caucasus and the Volga, during the just about most difficult days of the war, Soviet chemist V. Ye. Glushnev, wrote on the cover of the booklet by A. Kononov "Rasskazy o Lenine" [Stories About Lenin] (Detgiz, Moscow, 1942, published in 100,000 copies) the following to his small son: "My little son! Here is a very interesting book about our beloved leader Vladimir Ilich Lenin. You love Lenin more than anyone else, for which reason you must read this little book yourself, from beginning to end. And when we see each other, you will tell me all about

Lenin." At that time, on 28 August 1942, an unusual little booklet saw the light in Leningrad. Thirteen-year old Lenigrader V. Inchik, who had lost father and grandmother in the blockade and was suffering from dystrophy, transcribed "History of an Operation," which consisted of antifascist cartoons by N. Radlov, published in the journal KROKODIL; the young artist put on the book's cover all the necessary information: "Leningrad, Humor Publications, 1942. Published in 1 copy." The price was "300 grams of bread."

Because of their topical nature and maximal relevance and particular emotionality, the books published during wartime, with their high ideological-artistic standards and significant amount of information, could and should become the repositories of our historical memory: not only as silent combination of information about the past but also as educators, propagandists and sources of that very same military-historical and military-patriotic experience which was so fully gathered within publications issued during the Great Patriotic War.

To this day wartime books remain an important and efficient means of implementing tasks in the area of ideological work, as formulated in the draft new edition of the CPSU program and in shaping the active, efficient, humanistic and collectivistic morality and Soviet patriotism. Systematic efforts must be made to collect and study wartime books and to include them in the ideological education process of today and tomorrow. This means that an extensive permanent exhibit is needed in which books will not be considered separate items from the events of the time but, precisely, the events of the time will be recreated through all types of printed matter and will help us to imagine, to feel, to encompass in our sight our heroic past and cross anew the unforgettable thresholds leading to victory. Unfortunately, for the time being we neither have such an exhibit nor the necessary stock of books to be exhibited. The features of wartime book publishing and printing and the impossibility of completing book repositories at the proper time, and the "dispersal" of publications, which was so important in wartime, as well as the broad and strong front-line press which made books published between 1941 and 1945 one of the essential factors of the victory, all hindered the creation, even in the largest libraries in the country, of complete collections of wartime publications; naturally, the museums could neither set themselves nor resolve such a problem alone. However, the tremendous social and memorial significance of wartime books was so obvious that they were preserved by tens of thousands of families and not only preserved, for to this day they continue to live and serve the same great ideas for the sake of which they had been created. In many families war books may be found in their historical "surroundings," amidst newspapers, journals, documents, local or front-line publications, leaflets, press cuttings, maps and photographs dating from wartime.

It was precisely this that allowed the Book Lovers' Society to prepare the exhibit "Books Are Fighting" on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the celebration of the victory over fascism, using for this purpose materials from private libraries and collections. The purpose of the exhibit was to display books written during the Great Patriotic War as fighters and political workers, working people and heroes and irreplaceable friends at the front and the rear, and to depict in its completeness publishing activities as a most



important structural part of the nationwide exploit and as an almost all-embracing chronicle of this exploit. This resulted in an extensive topical-chronological exposition with 1,700 exhibits, including books, newspapers, journals, posters, leaflets and documents which describe the heroic path of the land of the soviets between 22 June 1941 and 9 May 1945. Included among the exhibits were hundreds of well-known books and posters as well as hundreds of one-of-a-kind materials which could not be found even at the USSR State Library imeni V. I. Lenin. There were books on the first and final years of the war; books on the heroism of the defenders of Moscow and Stalingrad; books published in 1943, the year of the great change, and in 1944, the year of the liberation of the fatherland from the Hitlerite aggressors; there were sets of "Communist, Forward!" and "Science is Fighting;" there were books from blockaded Leningrad and publications from the entire country from Vladivostok to Belomorsk and from Tashkent to Leningrad; there were exhibits entitled "The Weapon of Satire" and "Art is Fighting Fascism;" there were documents exposing the enemy, such as books on the Great Patriotic War topics of "The Brown Plague in the Court of History and Culture" and "The Savage Face of Fascism;" there were books printed under uninterrupted enemy fire in the basements of the naval base on Khanko Peninsula and in the army in the field. There were books by Dante and Pushkin, Zola and Tolstoy, Maupassant and Turgenev, books by Whitman and Veresayev, Lorca and Lermontov, Mickiewicz, Jack London, Jules Verne, Stevenson, Pogorelskiy, Karamzin, Chekhov and Krylov--the entire Russian and world literature. There were books for children and on science and noted military book series, which were one of the outstanding accomplishments of book publishers during the Great Patriotic War. The catalog of the exhibit, drafted by Izdatelstvo Kniga, listed works by more than 1,500 authors, compilers, editors and artists, books published by 200 publishing houses and their divisions, and by various institutions and organizations in 40 different cities in the country and in the active army. Books had been preserved and sent for the exhibit by 108 people from Moscow and the Moscow area and Leningrad. All in all, their own libraries and personal files turned out more than 3,000 copies of wartime books and as many as 1,000 issues of newspapers, journal, leaflets, letters and documents.

About 100 of the copies sent to the exhibit had been personally autographed, including by some of the greatest wartime writers, such as A. Tolstoy, A. Tvardovskiy, K. Simonov, A. Surkov, I. Erenburg, V. Grossman, V. Inber, A. Akhmatova and many others. The exhibition opened on 4 April 1985 in the beautiful exhibition hall of the palace of culture of the Plant imeni Likhachev. It remained open for no more than 15 days. However, within that short time more than 2,000 people were able to visit it. The need and importance today of such an exhibit is confirmed by the entries in the guest book.

Here is what wrote, for example, historian V. I. Miller, philologist N. A. Yevsina and teacher Ts. G. Miller, all of whom experienced the war: "...it seemed to us that we were prepared to come across the books of our childhood and youth. However, we were truly shaken up. The books in the exhibits, better than long speeches, speak of why and how our country was able to withstand in the mortal clash with the enemy... Seeing this exhibit is a real act of patriotic education." In their recorded impression, the personnel of the Main Political Administration of the Soviet Army and Navy emphasized the

significance of this exhibit today: "The exhibit triggers deep feelings and provides rich data for the heroic and patriotic upbringing of young people and for the practical work of ideological workers." War veteran and one of the oldest publishing workers and today editor-in-chief of Izdatelstvo Khudozhestvennaya Literatura A. I. Puzikov, wrote: "That is what love for books can accomplish! I have never seen such an outstanding exhibit, although I have visited many museums dealing with the events of the Great Patriotic War.... This exhibit is worthy of touring the entire union." "The exhibit is touching to the point of tears," noted personnel of Izdatelstvo Kniga. "A great deal of what was known as an isolated fact or heard about assumes an entirely different impact when everything is gathered together in such a truly original way." All comments express the main thing: concern for the fate of wartime books and belief that they must be seen by all generations of Soviet people and that those books are a no less powerful force in the struggle against the threat of war today than they were 40 years ago. Such an exhibit "must become a structural component of the great museum chronicle of the war," wrote workers in culture and the personnel of the scientific research department on book history and rare and particularly valuable editions of the USSR State Library imeni V. I. Lenin.

The wartime editions collected by the Book Lovers' Society made possible, after the "Books Are Fighting" exhibit closed down, to organize three more exhibits in Moscow: more than 500 items were displayed in May-June 1985 at the Central Club of the Soviet Army, on the occasion of the International Book Exhibition dedicated to the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism; military editions from private collections were also exhibited at the "Kosmos" stand of the All-Union Exhibition of Achievements of the National Economy, during the World Youth and Student Festival and the International Book Fair. Currently the Book Lovers' Society is preparing an exhibit of books on art published during the Patriotic War and kept in private collections. This will become part of a Soviet book exhibit which will open at the start of 1986 in the United States. During the ceremony of the inauguration of the exhibit "Books Are Fighting" in the Palace of Culture of the ZIL [Plant imeni Likhachev], one of the exhibitors, Great Patriotic War veteran and known bibliophile Yu. M. Valter, appealed to the owners of the exhibited books to gift the exhibits to the state for permanent display. The experience in the organization of the exhibit and subsequent efforts indicated that the Book Lovers' Society indeed can, while those who have preserved printed materials of the Patriotic War are still alive, create a unique and quite substantial state military book fund. However, this should be a living, "working" fund, a base for a separate exhibition or part of a general exhibition in the future museum of the Great Patriotic War. It could also become an ideal base for the exhibit on books published between 1941 and 1945 in the Book History Museum. Today, however, there is no place where to display this stock and the "Books Are Fighting" exposition on a permanent basis. Great Patriotic War veterans are impatiently awaiting the completion of the construction of the Victory Memorial on Mount Poklonnaya and hope to see not simply a memorial but a museum where wartime books will be exhibited.

For that reason the Book Lovers' Society turned to the USSR Ministry of Culture with the request to intercede in favor of including as part of the memorial on Mount Poklonnaya a museum to the Great Patriotic War, part of

which should include a permanent exhibit of the fighting books. The solution of this problem must be hastened for valuable memorial publications are already being received from war veterans and their families.

Obviously, the aspiration to preserve the memory of the past, expressed in the broad movement for the creation of public and state museums, is a new stage in the great process of turning history into a source of understanding of the present and a path to the future. It is a new stage on the path which followed the bloody roads of the war and the interpretation of the historical roots of events which were reflected with unique power in wartime books. If we consider the exhibit "Books Are Fighting" as the start of a broad collection of printed matter from wartime and the creation of a permanent exhibit and a museum fund, Yu. V. Maretin, who survived the blockade and is now a historian and owner of the largest of the known private collections of military books, is right by noting in the visitors' book that the exhibit "Books Are Fighting" is "the most important statesmanlike action taken by the Book Lovers' Society." Wartime books are an "untouchable reserve of spiritual strength of our people and pride in its exploits." This was the opinion of former front-line veterans and noted workers in the military press M. Matusovskiy, D. Ortenberg and Ye. Vorobyev. Such books remain alive even during the complex times of the 1980s. They teach everyone how to perform to the best of his possibilities and talent his sacred duty of man and citizen, the duty to the present and the past and to those who fell on the battlefield defending us and those who will come after us. The book of the terrible 1940s is a crystalline pure river which will supply us forever with the live water of the memory of the greatest of the people's exploits in world history. Today it must be seen by the children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren of those who saved peace and civilization 40 years ago.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/5

27 March 1986

## BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 17, Nov 85 (signed to press 28 Nov 85) pp 127-128

[Text] 1. "Spravochnik Partiynogo Rabotnika" [Party Worker's Handbook]. No 25. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 590 pp.

2. "Resheniya Partii i Pravitelstva po Khozyaystvennym Voprosam" [Party and Government Resolutions on economic Problems]. Collection of documents. Vol 15, part I. 1983-May 1984. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 542 pp.

3. "Osnovnyye Napravleniya Ekonomicheskogo i Sotsialnogo Razvitiya SSSR na 1986-1990 i na Period do 2000 Goda" [Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1986-1990 and the Period Through the Year 2000]. Draft. Pravda, Moscow, 1985, 96 pp.

4. "SSSR-Kuba" [USSR-Cuba]. Documents of Friendship and Solidarity. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 63 pp.

5. "Soveschaniye Politicheskogo Konsultativnogo Komiteta Gosudarstv-Uchastnikov Varshavskogo Dogovora, Sofiya, 22-23 Oktyabrya 1985 Goda" [Conference of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact Members, Sofia, 22-23 October 1985]. Documents and materials. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 32 pp.

6. "Vizit Generalnogo Sekretarya TsK KPSS M.S. Gorbacheva v Narodnuyu Respubliku Bolgariyu 24-25 Oktyabrya 1985 Goda" [Visit to Bulgaria of M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee Secretary, to the Bulgarian People's Republic 24-25 October 1985]. Documents and materials. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 32 pp with illustrations.

7. Chebrikov, V.M. "Pod Znamenem Oktyabrya -- k Novym Rubezham Sovershenstvovaniya Sotsializma" [Under the October Banner to New Heights of Advancement of Socialism]. Report at the ceremony on the occasion of the 68th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses 6 November 1985. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 31 pp.

8. Arbatov, A.A. and Tolkachev, M.V. "Chto Znachit Khozyaystvovat Ekonomno" [The Meaning of Economical Management]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 223 pp.

9. Akhmedov, a. "Islam v Sovremennoy Ideyno-Politicheskoy Borbe" [Islam in the Contemporary Ideological and Political Struggle]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 240 pp.
10. "Vneshnyaya Politika Sovetskogo Soyuza" [The Soviet Union's Foreign Policy]. By Nikhamin, V. P. (head of authors' group), Adamishin, A. L., Bogush, Ye. Yu. et al. Editors: Tikhvinskiy, S.L., Vorontsov G.A., Nikhamin, V.P. et al. Preface by A.A. Gromyko. Third revised and expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 400 pp.
11. Veselitskiy, A.A. "Ubiytsy. Strategiya Destabilizatsiya i taktika Terrora na Apenninakh" [Assassins. The Strategy of Destabilization and Terrorism Tactics in the Appenines]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 272 pp.
12. Duclos. J. "Memuary" [Memoirs]. Vol 3, 1954-1969. Translated from the French. Second edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 464 pp with illustrations.
13. "Yevropa XX Veka: Problema Mira i Bezopasnosti" [20th Century Europe: The Problem of Peace and Security]. Authors: A.O. Chubaryan, Z.S. Belousova, A.M. Filitov et al. Editors: A.O. Chubaryan (responsible editor), A.L. Adamishin, V.B. Kozmin et al. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1985, 269 pp.
14. "Kapitalizm 80-kh Godov" [Capitalism of the 1980s] (Aggravation of Structural Contradictions in the Economy). Karkhin, G.I. and Shpilko, G.A. responsible editors. Mysl, Moscow, 1985, 302 pp.
15. Kovrigina, M.D. "V Neoplatnom Dolgu [Unpayable Debt]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 256 pp with illustrations.
16. "Kultura Vizantii. IV-Pervaya Polovina VII V." [Byzantine Culture, 4th-First Half of the 7th Centuries]. Edited by S.S. Averintsev, A.D. Alekstidze, A.V. Bank et al. Z.B. Udaltsova responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1984, 725 pp.
17. "Mezhdunarodnoye Rabocheye dvizheniye. Voprosy Istorii i Teorii" [The International Labor Movement. Problems of History and Theory]. Vol 7. "Rabochiy Klass i Natsionalno-Osvoboditelnyye Revolyutsii Posle Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny" [The Working Class and National Liberation revolutions ater World War II]. Chief editorial commission: B.N. Ponomarev et al. Responsible editors: K.N. Brutents and G.F. Kim. Mysl, Moscow, 1985, 591 pp.
18. "Militarizm SShA: Voyennaya Mashina, Bloki, Bazy i Akty Agressii" [U.S. Militarism: Military Machine, Blocs, Bases and Acts of Aggression]. Reference. Authors: Alekseyev, R.F., Krutskikh, A.V. and Svetlov, A.A. Petrovskiy, V.F. and Chervova N.F. general editors. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 367 pp, maps.
19. Muri, F. "Izbrannyye Stati i Rechi" [Selected Articles and Speeches] (1964-1984). Translated from the German. D. Nikolayev, compiler of the collection and general translation editor. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 367 pp.

20. Myasnikov, A.F. (Myasnikyan). "Izbrannyye Proizvedeniya" [Selected Works] Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 263 pp.
21. Nikiforov, L.A. and Ostrovidov, Yu.P. "Sotsialisticheskaya Federativnaya Respublika Yugoslaviya" [The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia]. Reference. Third expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 127 pp with illustrations.
22. Nikolayev, L.N. "Kabulskiye Rassvety" [Kabul Dawns]. Sovetskaya Rossiya, Moscow, 1985, 176 pp.
23. "Obshchestvennyy Kharakter Proizvodstva i Sotsialisticheskaya Sobstvennost" [Public Production and Socialist Ownership]. V.N. Cherkovets general editor. Ekonomika, Moscow, 1985, 288 pp.
24. "Ocherki Istorii Ideologicheskoy Deyatel'nosti KPSS. Oktyabr 1917-1937 Gg." [Essays on the History of CPSU Ideological Activities October 1917-1937]. Morozov, L.F., Andronov, S.A., Gorbunov, V.V. et al. editors. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 415 pp.
25. Petrukhin, A.A. and Churilov, Ye.M. "Nepokorennyy Vulkan" [Untamed Volcano]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 256 pp with illustrations.
26. Porokhovskiy, A.A. "Bolshoy Bizness: Put k Gospodstvu" [Big Business: The Road to Domination]. (Imperialism and Commodity Relations). Mysl, Moscow, 1985, 207 pp, tables.
27. "Pravda Protiv Domyslov" [Truth Versus Conjectures]. Scientific nature and realism of CPSU policy and groundlessness of its bourgeois falsifiers. Authors: V.L. Savelyev (head of group), V.P. Andryushchenko, V.D. Doroshenko et al. Politizdat Ukrainy, Kiev, 1985, 303 pp.
28. Prodev, S. "Vesna Geniya" [Spring of the Genius]. Attempt at a literary portrait. Translated from the Bulgarian. Third edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 286 pp.
29. Proshunin, N.F. "Chto Takoye Polemika?" [What Is Polemics?]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 335 pp.
30. "Razdumya o Zemle" [Thought About the Earth]. Collection compiled by Yu.P. Kovyryalov, I.K. Liseyev and S.A. Nikolskiy. Editors: A.N. Kashtanov (editor in chief), T.S. Maltsev, V.A. Kovda et al. Preface by D.P. Gribanov and R.G. Yanovskiy. Agropromizdat, Moscow, 1985, 271 pp.
31. Razina, M.M. "Partiynyy Komitet i Sotsialnaya Aktivnost Zhenshchin" [The Party Committee and Women's Social Activeness]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 63 pp.
32. "Svyashchennaya Voyna. Vek XX" [Holy War. 20th Century]. Compiled, prefaced and commented by A.D. Grigoryev. Molodaya Gvardiya, Moscow, 1985, 765 pp with illustrations.



33. "Sovremennyye Mezhdunarodnyye Ekonomicheskiye Otnosheniya" [Contemporary International Economic Relations]. Collective monograph. Editors: Menshikov, S.M., Pletnev, E.P. and Shchetinin, V.D. (responsible editor). Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1985, 494 pp.
34. "Sovremennyy Kapitalizm" [Contemporary Capitalism]. Socioeconomic Manual. A.G. Mileykovskiy, general editor. Compiled by A.A. Grechikhin. Politizdat, Moscow, 367 pp, tables.
35. "Spravochnik Propagandista-Mezhdunarodnika" [Manual for the Propagandist-Internationalist]. V.V. Zagladin and N.V. Shishlin general editors. Compiled by N.K. Golovko. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 237 pp.
36. "SSSR i Mezhdunarodnyye Ekonomicheskiye Otnosheniya" [The USSR and International Economic Relations]. Collection of documents and materials on the positions held by the USSR on problems of the reorganization of international economic relations and the establishment of a new international economic order. Compiled by I.D. Ivanov, N.I. Kuzminskiy, I.K. Kukin and others. Editors: A.N. Manzhulo (collegium chairman), V.N. Azov, N.P. Barinov et al. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya, Moscow, 1985, 288 pp.
37. Stepanova, Ye.A. "Friedrich Engles." Brief biographic sketch. Fourth revised and expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1985, 238 pp.
38. Timofeyev, T.T. "Imperializm i Proletariat" [Imperialism and Proletariat]. Nauka, Moscow, 1985, 541 pp.
39. Chicherina, N.G. "Mezhdunarodnyye Kontserny: Sotsialnaya Politika, Propaganda" [International Concerns: Social Policy and Propaganda]. Nauka, Moscow, 1985, 351 pp.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1985

5003

CSO: 1802/5

END